V.L. ARTEMOV

PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE

IN THE STRATEGY OF IMPERIALISM

Publisher's Note

The following is the first English edition of *Psychological Warfare in the Strategy of Imperialism* by V.L. Artemov. It has been translated from the Russian original edition, published by "Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya," Moscow 1983.

ISBN: 978-1-997536-21-5

THE NOVEMBER 8TH PUBLISHING HOUSE
TORONTO 2025

CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Psychological Warfare in the Anti-Socialist Strategy of Imperialism in the 1950s-60s 18

Psychological Warfare in the Anti-Socialist Strategy of Imperialism in the 1970s and Early 1980s 52

"Project Truth" and the "Democracy and Public Diplomacy" Program as Components of Psychological War Unleashed by the United States 101

INTRODUCTION

(The Strategy of Imperialism and Psychological Warfare — Theoretical Aspect)

The word strategy is used so frequently in the West and in so many different contexts that it is necessary to clarify what is meant in this book.

Imperialist strategy is the totality of plans and actions developed and carried out purposefully to achieve the goals set by imperialism. Types of strategy can be defined based on various criteria: for example, by stated goals (a strategy of world domination), by scale (global strategy), by target (anti-communist strategy), by subject (imperialist strategy, strategy of American imperialism) and so on. Thus, one may speak, for instance, of an anti-Soviet strategy as activity aimed at undermining Soviet power and the influence of the Soviet Union abroad; of a strategy of anti-communist propaganda as a combination of various methods, techniques, slogans and theses that serve to achieve the political goals of anti-communist strategy; of a strategy of neo-colonialism as the sum of key directions and tactical manoeuvres taken by imperialist powers to assert their positions in developing countries at certain stages of contemporary international development; of the strategies of American, British imperialism, and so on, as policies designed to achieve imperialist objectives by the national detachments of the world bourgeois class.

The concept of imperialist strategy covers a wide range of political, economic, ideological, propaganda, diplomatic, military and other actions, each of which represents a distinct area of activity of the imperialist forces and can therefore also be viewed from the standpoint of its own strategy. Imperialist strategy is pursued across a number of directions. The

USSR, for example, faces the anti-communist, anti-socialist, anti-Soviet and neo-colonialist strategies of imperialism. One can speak of imperialist strategies as they apply to individual regions of the world (Asia, Africa, Latin America, Southeast Asia, the Middle East) and to specific countries (India, Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Lebanon, etc.). In such cases, the strategies of individual capitalist countries often come to the fore. Imperialist strategy, as the general course of modern capitalism at its stage of decay, is manifested here in the specific policies of a given capitalist power.

This book discusses imperialist strategy in the broadest sense of the term, but focuses primarily on one of its components — the anti-socialist strategy of imperialism, which cannot be understood or interpreted outside the broader context of the anti-communist strategy. The latter expresses one of the aspects of the defining contradiction of our era. This contradiction is rooted in the character of the historical period we are living through. "It is marked," said Y.V. Andropov, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, at the June Plenum (1983) of the CPSU Central Committee, "by an unprecedented — for the entire postwar period — intensity and sharpness in the confrontation of two fundamentally opposing worldviews, two political courses — socialism and imperialism."*

When we examine the anti-communist strategy of imperialism — the course taken by the contemporary bourgeoisie in its confrontation with Marxism-Leninism on a global scale — through the prism of its anti-socialist (i.e. directed against socialist countries) and anti-Soviet (i.e. directed against the Soviet Union) policies, we obtain a clear understanding of

* Andropov, Y.V., *Speech at the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, June 15, 1983*, *Pravda*, June 16, 1983.

modern imperialism in action.

The general crisis of capitalism has spread into all spheres of social life, and its manifestations have deepened. What is new in this crisis is the unprecedented growth of the role of ideological and psychological tools in the tactics, methods and techniques of class and political struggle — the previously unseen emphasis on the complex of activities commonly referred to as psychological warfare.

In the broadest sense of the term, psychological warfare is a system of actions involving continuous, comprehensive, coordinated and purposeful use of various means — from propaganda, economic, diplomatic and other pressures to intelligence-sabotage operations and military actions — all capable of exerting psychological influence on the opponent, forcing them to take actions beneficial to the initiators of the war. In the narrower sense, psychological warfare is a type or doctrine of propaganda widely applied in the capitalist world. It aims not only to change beliefs and influence the consciousness of the target audience but also to create political and psychological situations intended to elicit specific behaviours from the population, its groups, or even the ruling circles of another country.

Psychological warfare is a logical product of the crisis of bourgeois ideology. Unable to win over working people to its policies through ideas that have revealed themselves as anti-people, the bourgeoisie is compelled to resort to social deception on an ever-larger scale. It shifts the ideological struggle — both within capitalist society and on the international stage — onto the tracks of psychological warfare.

The bourgeoisie sees its objective capacity to wage ideological struggle through the methods of psychological warfare in the fact that, despite their differences, both ideological influence and psychological pressure pursue a common goal

— to control people. However, their methods and commonly used techniques differ significantly because they rely on different psychological mechanisms. It is known that the mental process consists of several links: from emotions to volitional acts, decisions and, finally, to action — that is, all the processes in a person's mind before they act. Conscious action is preceded by the reception of information from the external world, its processing and comprehension.

The tools and methods of psychological warfare influence the human psyche in such a way as to bypass rational stages or affect only superficial and shallow levels of consciousness. "Not to thought, but to action" — this is inscribed on the armour of the knights and mercenaries of psychological warfare in every era of class battles, and especially in the era of imperialism. It is a motto that encapsulates the aim of their efforts. "From thought to action!" — this is the slogan of the ideological influence of a progressive social order, which views the awakening of thought as a necessary prelude to human action.

Psychological influence is an effective force — it can dominate a person, turning them into a submissive tool of someone else's will, a puppet in the hands of chance, reducing them to a creature blinded by rage or fear. Of course, psychological influence can also be positive. It all depends on its purpose and content.

Still, ideological influence is stronger and more effective. As Karl Marx wrote: "...*Ideas* that seize our minds, dominate our convictions and to which reason chains our conscience — these are bonds that cannot be broken without tearing our hearts; they are demons that man can only defeat by surrendering to them."* Why? Because ideas have powerful roots in the depths of life. From the moment of mankind's appear-

* Marx, K. and Engels, F., *Works*, vol. 1, p. 118, Russ. ed.

ance, they have pushed its history forward — through the development of society's productive forces and the relations of production, which in turn are reflected in people's views and thoughts.

Psychological influence does not have such deep roots. Moreover, it arises on the basis of already established relations and entrenched ideological views. Once it appears, it becomes entangled with them, even attempts to merge with them. This is where the potential of psychological warfare lies.

One of the secrets behind the inner mechanism of psychological warfare — as a substitute for purely ideological influence — lies in its potential to manipulate the dominant, widely shared values of a given society. The key to this lies in the very socio-psychological nature of these values. U.S. President Reagan declares a campaign for "democracy" because democracy — even in its limited bourgeois form — is not irrelevant to the working people in capitalist countries. But he does not say that for him democracy means something entirely different from what it means to a worker, a farmer or an office employee. For him, as a representative of monopoly capital, freedom and democratic rights mean the freedom to exploit, the right to ignore the interests of the people in the name of the rich and those who seek to become even richer. For Reagan, "rights" are the legalization of the ability to turn America into the domain of millionaires and the entire world into a feeding trough for giant corporations. Reagan's version of democracy is an indulgence for any action — including military ones — that may be required to secure the dominance of America's richest, both domestically and abroad. Working people, on the other hand, want to use bourgeois democracy as a tool that provides some, albeit very limited, means of defending their rights and restraining monopoly arbitrariness. Thus, the value of democracy is perceived very

differently. Yet many people in the capitalist world fail to see this difference and are prepared to defend "democracy" that actually serves the interests of capitalists, not workers. This explains why the bourgeoisie does everything in its power to prevent the truth about genuine, socialist democracy from reaching the broader working masses in the non-socialist part of the world.

The ultimate goal of psychological warfare is to shake, break and undermine the moral and psychological resilience of the opponent. To a significant extent, it is meant to help create conditions that allow, at the right moment, for a sudden attack — to issue an ultimatum, to launch a swift strike against a relaxed or weakened adversary — whether in the sphere of military conflict or political struggle.

In peacetime, imperialist psychological warfare against the peoples of the world is waged through many means, but above all through propaganda. This is understandable — propaganda is the most widespread, accessible and, at least geographically, unrestricted form of influencing the opposing side. Moreover, it carries an immeasurably greater psychological charge than other tools of psychological warfare. In the context of modern ideological struggle, propaganda takes on even greater importance, as it is conducted through numerous channels — many of them entirely open — that allow for the use of a wide variety of methods and techniques. These include radio, television, the press, film, exhibitions, cultural and scientific exchange, and so on. The distribution of video recordings and audio tapes plays a significant role. It is also important to note that the scientific and technological revolution has paved the way for the massive expansion of mass media — which greatly increases the reach and intensity of ongoing psychological warfare operations.

This latter factor increasingly draws the attention of im-

perialist psychological warfare strategists towards propaganda. In today's conditions, when blunt Reagan-style propaganda fails to produce the desired effect, they are forced to combine it with more subtle methods of influence — especially against socialist countries — that are "quiet," "invisible," and offer no opportunity to catch the slanderer or provocateur red-handed or to accuse them of aggression and interference in internal affairs. Propaganda as a form of psychological influence offers such potential. It is a powerful and flexible tool for the bourgeoisie to influence the broad masses — not only their thinking but also their behaviour, actions and conduct. It combines ideological, informational and psychological capabilities. At the core of the "social control" methods developed by the modern bourgeoisie lies a system of psychological levers for pressuring the masses — levers that can steer the masses in the desired direction without having to resort to complex and, for the bourgeoisie, obviously dubious rational persuasion. "The masses," wrote V.I. Lenin, "in the era of the printing press and parliamentarianism *cannot* be led without a broadly ramified, systematically executed and well-equipped system of flattery, lies, fraud, juggling with fashionable and popular catchwords, and making promises of all kinds of reforms and benefits to workers — as long as they abandon revolutionary struggle to overthrow the bourgeoisie."*

The widespread use of psychological warfare methods by anti-communists has undoubtedly complicated the ideological struggle. Counterbalancing this is the struggle of progressive forces — both against bourgeois ideology and against its propaganda. Anti-communist propaganda acts as a vehicle for hidden ideological influence, and this necessitates special, separate analysis as part of the broader task of exposing and critiquing the entire system of bourgeois influence on the

* Lenin, V.I, *Collected Works*, vol. 30, p. 176, Russ. ed.

masses — a task that lies beyond the scope of this work.

It is worth emphasizing one feature of modern anti-communist propaganda: its transformation into a specific class function of the bourgeois state. Anti-communist propaganda is not simply a means of spreading, implanting and reinforcing anti-communist ideology. Its role is much broader — without it, bourgeois ideology could not function effectively. At the same time, anti-communist propaganda has become an essential element of the foreign policy of imperialist states — a required function of their foreign policy institutions, serving the interests of the bourgeois class state.

It is through anti-communism, as both ideology and policy, that the class solidarity of the capitalists becomes visible. In recent years, anti-communist propaganda increasingly reflects the shared class interests of the bourgeoisie of the advanced capitalist countries. Within it, inter-imperialist contradictions and clashes between the interests of different factions of the international bourgeoisie are significantly minimized.

In the sphere of economic and political relations, the concrete interests of capitalists from individual countries may clash, and different groups or individuals may seek their own independent line in dealing with socialist countries. Here, compromises do not threaten the core values of capitalism or the bourgeois way of life. In the ideological realm, however, the interests of the bourgeoisie in all capitalist countries align. This sphere reflects the collective interest of the bourgeoisie as a class, regardless of national differences.

Today, it is entirely justified to speak of anti-communist propaganda as a single, unified phenomenon — even though it is carried out by different capitalist states, is a component of the national policies of various bourgeois groups and governments, and is targeted at different audiences — regions,

country groups and individual nations. From the perspective of its target — communism in all its forms, and above all real socialism — and the goals pursued, the anti-communist propaganda of capitalist countries constitutes a unified whole. At the same time, each capitalist state uses it to pursue its own national agenda, tied to its internal and foreign policy line and the specific problems it faces in various regions. Nevertheless, anti-communism remains anti-communism.

To understand the strategy and tactics of anti-communist propaganda correctly, it is useful to place it within the overall system of bourgeois propaganda, and to identify some of its specific forms — the ones the Soviet Union encounters in the course of ideological and political struggle.

The typology of bourgeois propaganda — classified by its class-political focus — reflects its system and includes the concepts of bourgeois, imperialist, anti-communist, anti-socialist and anti-Soviet propaganda.

Bourgeois propaganda is the broadest concept. It includes all propaganda activity aimed at justifying, reinforcing and defending the capitalist system, as well as spreading, implanting and consolidating bourgeois ideology. It is carried out by the bourgeois class through propaganda and information tools owned by the bourgeois state, private capitalists, bourgeois social organizations and so on — that is, through all available instruments of ideological influence controlled by the bourgeoisie.

Imperialist propaganda is a subtype of bourgeois propaganda. It justifies and supports the expansionist foreign policy aims of individual capitalist powers and of the imperialist world as a whole. It takes two main forms: domestic (within developed capitalist countries) and foreign (outside their borders). The foreign propaganda of imperialist states and circles, in turn, is divided into propaganda directed at other

developed capitalist countries, at developing countries and at socialist countries.

Anti-communist propaganda is one facet of both bourgeois and imperialist propaganda. Its purpose is to discredit and undermine Marxism-Leninism — both in theory and practice — in order to assert bourgeois ideology and save capitalism. The subject matter of anti-communist propaganda includes the distortion of Marxist-Leninist theory, the discrediting of real socialism, slander against the workers' and communist movement as a whole and against individual parties within it. The target audience of anti-communist propaganda is the population of the entire world. For tactical purposes, the bourgeoisie also uses it to support policies aimed at undermining democratic and anti-imperialist movements, creating division within the workers' movement and justifying neo-colonialist policy.

Anti-socialist propaganda is part of bourgeois, imperialist and anti-communist propaganda. It is aimed at discrediting and undermining real socialism. It is carried out in the capitalist world, in developing countries and — in particularly acute form — in socialist countries. It has two main directions: the undermining of the very idea of socialist construction based on Marxism-Leninism, and the weakening or even attempted elimination of socialism in specific socialist countries.

Anti-Soviet propaganda is intended to spread slanderous ideas about the Soviet social and state system and to carry out all kinds of actions against the Soviet state and the CPSU. Its goal is to discredit and weaken the Soviet Union and the CPSU, to divide the socialist community, the workers' and communist movement, and to reduce the influence of communist parties within individual countries of the non-socialist world. It is conducted in capitalist countries, developing countries and socialist countries — and separately, in a specif-

ic form, within the territory of the Soviet Union. The sources of anti-Soviet propaganda may include not only bourgeois and imperialist propaganda and information outlets but also propaganda organs of revisionist and other opportunist elements within the workers' movement. It is inseparable from the broader current of anti-socialist propaganda, although its subject matter does not fully overlap with it. Increasingly, it is becoming the main ideological content of anti-communist propaganda.

This classification is not arbitrary. Each of its components is distinct, arising from the pressing tasks facing the capitalist class and involving specific social forces pursuing specific goals under specific conditions at specific times, and directed at differing audiences. While they all share a common foundation — the desire to support the restoration of capitalism in socialist countries and to halt the spread of communist ideology and socialist aspirations in the non-socialist world — they differ in terms of subject matter and targets, strategic and tactical approaches, and their arsenal of tools, methods and techniques. What characterizes bourgeois propaganda in general is present, to some extent, in all of them. However, the individual types of bourgeois propaganda are not identical to one another. They remain within its overall framework due to their shared class character, common sources and unified methodology.

The current flood of anti-communist propaganda in the non-socialist world — spreading murky, false anti-communist stereotypes and anti-Soviet prejudices — is made possible in part by the information monopoly held in the non-socialist world by a handful of major Western news agencies and corporations. These supply 90-95 per cent of all international news content consumed by mass media. In these muddy waters, imperialism still manages to catch sizeable "fish." The

dominance of big capitalist and state-capitalist business in the Western media and propaganda system contributes to the entrenchment of anti-communism in the public consciousness of the non-socialist world.

"Information imperialism," as Urho Kekkonen called the domination of international news by a handful of Western agencies in the capitalist world, is one of the most important factors that allows psychological warfare to become a major tool of imperialist foreign policy — particularly that of the United States — and a function of the bourgeois state. Without this, the "big lie," which underpins the entire foreign policy of President Reagan, could never have gone so far or been proclaimed so openly. Thanks to a well-honed mechanism of class-based control over information, exposures of these lies remain limited to a relatively narrow circle. This is the foundation for the "might makes right" approach to information that is so characteristic of the entire style of Reagan's foreign policy.

From this, it follows that there is no longer a single bourgeois propaganda or information outlet that does not follow the anti-communist line. However, the major capitalist countries have also created several special propaganda agencies that deal exclusively in spreading anti-communist ideology and directly serve anti-socialist and anti-Soviet policy. The most prominent of these are the U.S.-controlled pseudo-private radio stations *Radio Free Europe* and *Radio Liberty*, which target socialist countries, as well as *RIAS* in West Berlin, which is part of the *Voice of America* network. Their existence directly demonstrates that ideology and propaganda serve the bourgeois state — and that psychological warfare is an essential instrument of imperialism in its struggle against the progressive development of the world.

As a component of imperialist strategy, psychological

warfare performs a number of important functions that support the implementation of imperialist policy in various areas. A simple list of these functions helps explain why socialist countries treat the exposure of psychological warfare provocateurs with the utmost seriousness.

Indeed, psychological warfare — waged by the bourgeoisie worldwide against working people — aims to prevent the spread of communist ideology. By vilifying communism and trying to discredit real socialism as the practical embodiment of Marxism-Leninism, bourgeois propaganda pursues such strategic goals of imperialist policy as strengthening the position of the bourgeoisie, reinforcing the foundations of the capitalist system, and, at the same time, squeezing the socialist world and undermining the global influence of communist ideas. "A battle is being waged for the minds and hearts of billions of people on the planet. And the future of mankind depends to a large extent on the outcome of this ideological struggle," said Y.V. Andropov at the June 1983 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. "This is why it is extremely important to be able to convey, clearly and convincingly, the truth about socialist society, its advantages and its peaceful policies to the broadest masses across the world. It is just as important to skilfully expose the lying, subversive propaganda of imperialism."*

Psychological warfare directed at socialist countries occupies a special place in the imperialist strategy aimed at restoring capitalism in those nations. At present, this strategic line is built on attempts to create a "fifth column" within socialist countries, to destabilize the internal situation by provoking discontent, nationalist sentiment and other harmful moods. Western propaganda promises support and assistance to those

* Andropov, Y.V., *Speech at the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, June 15, 1983*.

who might join the ranks of anti-socialist counter-revolutionary forces and actively interferes in the internal affairs of socialist states. "The class enemy openly declares its intent to eliminate the socialist system. President Reagan has called for a new 'crusade' against communism. And one of the main tools for achieving this goal, imperialism sees in 'psychological warfare.' The West wages it at the highest, most hysterically anti-Soviet and anti-communist pitch. The enemy has resorted to outright banditry on the airwaves. What we are witnessing is an attempt to launch a full-scale propaganda and information intervention against us — to turn radio and television into tools of interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states and into vehicles for subversive operations," said K.U. Chernenko, member of the Politburo and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his report to the June 1983 Plenum.*

Imperialism is currently using psychological warfare to accustom the global public to the idea that intervention in the internal affairs of other countries is somehow unrelated to the constant meddling by imperialist propaganda organs, politicians, diplomats, businessmen and military leaders from the major Western powers. On one hand, they openly justify intervention under the pretext of defending mythical freedoms and human rights — some so-called "universal democracy." On the other, they subtly condition people to accept the legitimacy of subversive actions, especially in the form of propaganda and media-based interference in other nations' internal affairs. It must be recognized that the targets of such intervention are not only socialist countries but any country that imperialism selects as a focus for its schemes.

---

* Chernenko, K.U., *Current Issues of the Party's Ideological and Mass-Political Work. Report at the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, June 14, 1983*, *Pravda*, June 15, 1983.

By spreading lies about communism, scaring the peoples of developing countries with fabricated stories of a "Soviet threat," misinforming them about the policies of socialist states and the activities of imperialist powers and multinational corporations, inciting conflicts between factions, tribes and ethnic groups — steering them away from their true national interests — the psychological warfare apparatus of the Western powers works to maintain neo-colonialist control in nations that have shaken off colonial rule. Psychological warfare has become an essential element of imperialist neo-colonialist policy.

The struggle against national liberation movements occupies a major place in imperialist strategy. The psychological warfare agencies of imperialism continuously target all patriotic forces in the developing world. Accusations shift constantly, but the most common lie throughout the years has been the myth of "Moscow's schemes." The most recent smear campaign — targeting national liberation movements across the globe — involved slanderous accusations that the Soviet Union had supposedly created and continues to support "international terrorism." U.S. President Reagan's claim that all global conflicts stem from the Soviet Union, which he called the "evil empire," was crafted to turn global public opinion against all peoples receiving international aid from the USSR — against all patriotic forces resisting imperialist domination in a life-or-death struggle. These attacks on the Soviet Union are also intended to conceal the real instigators and organizers of international terrorism — such as Israeli pirates acting against the Palestinian people and neighbouring Arab nations.

Without the deployment of large-scale psychological warfare against the peoples of the world — including their own populations — the imperialists could not push through mas-

sive military budgets or maintain the climate of fear and tension needed to satisfy the ever-growing appetites of militarists and the military-industrial complex. Psychological warfare, now just as cherished by the imperialists as military preparation, has enabled the head of the Washington administration to claim that America could win a nuclear war. Only the fever of psychological warfare can explain why so many figures in the Reagan administration spoke publicly about the possibility of a "limited," "protracted" or otherwise "winnable" nuclear war.

Amid the absence of full unity among Western allies and the growth of inter-imperialist contradictions, psychological warfare against socialist countries — and against all the peoples of the world — is meant, in the eyes of its architects, to help unify the West against the so-called "communist threat." Through psychological warfare, Washington seeks to force its military allies into line, compelling them to follow the United States into dangerous militaristic ventures. By intimidating public opinion in Western Europe, the Americans aim to erase any memory of how détente brought peace and the promise of a calm future to the continent.

Finally, a key objective in U.S. imperialist planning is the use of psychological warfare to promote the idea of Pax Americana — "the American world," or, in other words, global domination by the United States. American foreign policy propaganda — especially under President Reagan — is full of praise for the American way of life, American democracy and American capitalism as if they represent the gold standard of economic prosperity. This serves as the justification for the "right" of the U.S. to global supremacy.

The materials of the June 1983 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee note that mankind is now living through a difficult and troubling period in its history. This moment is

marked — more sharply and intensely than at any time since the war — by a clash of worldviews: socialist and imperialist. The great achievements of real socialism, the growing influence of the international communist and workers' movement, the progressive development of countries that have thrown off colonialism and the powerful anti-war movement — all of these deeply affect people's consciousness. At the same time, imperialist reaction, led by the far-right forces in the United States, is pushing the world towards the brink of nuclear catastrophe. An unprecedented psychological war — both in scale and aggression — has been unleashed against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Confronting this course is the policy of preventing nuclear war — the policy of peace and cooperation carried out by the socialist community in the interest of the broad working masses across the world.

PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE IN THE ANTI-SOCIALIST STRATEGY OF IMPERIALISM IN THE 1950S-60S

From the very inception of the Soviet state, anti-Soviet and anti-communist hysteria has always served as a smokescreen for subversive actions, hostile campaigns and the aggressive plans of imperialism. For a long time, psychological warfare was waged against our country from beyond its borders. Until the 1940s and 1950s, the technical means did not yet exist to transmit anti-Soviet slogans, appeals, misleading information and other tools of psychological warfare into the territory of the USSR and to its mass audience. Isolated sabotage operations by agents sent into the country failed to produce any significant impact. At most, the enemies of socialism could try to influence a few unstable Soviet citizens and, through them, spread harmful attitudes and anti-Soviet views within their small social circles. Thus, psychological warfare directed against socialism raged mostly in the capitalist world, with the aim of deterring the working people in foreign countries from supporting communism and the world's first socialist state, justifying aggressive plans against it, masking preparations for new imperialist adventures, and distracting workers in capitalist countries from class struggle and the pressing internal problems of bourgeois society.

The imperialist forces' attempts to shift psychological warfare — along with its counter-revolutionary and subversive consequences — into the territory of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries began shortly after the end of the Second World War.

The guns had barely fallen silent on the battlefields of the anti-fascist war when American imperialism took up Hitler's spectre of the "communist threat" and, hiding behind it, set

course for global domination. Standing in its way were the Soviet Union, the people's democracies and the strengthened international communist and workers' movement.

In April 1945 — literally on the eve of Germany's surrender — a meeting took place in the White House under President Truman to determine the U.S. position ahead of the Allied discussions on Germany's capitulation. It was there that the decision was made to replace the Allied approach towards the USSR with a "tough line."* This marked the beginning of preparations for the "Cold War."

What is meant by this term? It refers to hostile actions across all areas of international relations towards the target of foreign policy — actions that may go as far as the extreme. Almost all normal relations and exchanges — economic, cultural, scientific, sports-related — are effectively cut off. Diplomatic relations may be the only ones to remain, and even then, only as a thin thread connecting the targeted country to the initiator of the "Cold War." Extremist military and political measures, poorly hidden or even openly declared plans to use force to bring the target into submission, keep relations "on the brink of war." The "Cold War" is a form of pressure applied across all fronts to force the targeted country to take steps beneficial to its opponent. Psychological warfare becomes one of the most crucial components of the "Cold War," fuelled and sustained by sanctions, obstructions and blackmail in all areas of engagement.

A precursor to the Cold War was the wave of attacks on the Soviet Union, communists and communism that swept through the capitalist press — especially the American press — as early as the spring of 1945.

Anti-Sovietism began to influence domestic American propaganda so strongly that in June 1946, one of the closest

* Truman, H., *Memoirs*, vol. I, New York, 1955, p. 72.

advisers to the late President F. Roosevelt, former Secretary of the Interior H. Ickes, lamented: "Sometimes, when I hear these anti-communist speeches, I wonder whether Goebbels is really dead... It seems to me he simply emigrated to the United States."*

Winston Churchill's famous Fulton speech in March 1946 — often viewed as the Cold War's declaration — was essentially post-factum. It merely packaged into mass propaganda slogans what was already guiding political actions. "Immediate formation of international military forces to fight communism, and the organization of a community of English-speaking nations — especially in military matters"** — this was how Churchill formulated the tasks that Western propaganda would take up, aiming to win public support in capitalist countries. The previously vague hostility now took the form of the "communist threat," an emotionally charged stereotype in the style of Goebbels. At the same time, this was the signal to launch a broad, coordinated offensive — including a propaganda campaign — against the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe.

Churchill's appeals signalled that the West had decided to mobilize all anti-Soviet forces. In putting forward the idea of "driving communism back" into the borders of the Soviet Union, Churchill coined a slogan that the imperialists would use for years — and continue to use — to mask their main goal: the elimination of the Soviet system. Falsely accusing the Soviet Union of aggression, Churchill formulated the first version of the ideological justification for imperialism's very real — not imagined — aggressive plans and actions against the socialist countries of Europe. The "means to achieve imperialist demands," which Churchill urged his audience to

* *New York Herald Tribune*, June 26, 1945.

** *The Times*, March 3, 1946.

"keep in mind," involved both the preparation for intervention by Western powers and active support for reactionary forces inside Eastern European states.

In both scenarios, propaganda played a central role. However, there was a notable distinction between the tasks of bourgeois propaganda in capitalist countries and those of political propaganda directed at socialist states. In the imperialist countries, the bourgeois propaganda machine inflamed fear of a supposed Soviet threat to gain public support for preparations to attack the USSR. Meanwhile, propaganda aimed at Eastern European countries was inciting in nature — designed to encourage hostile elements and offer them, at the very least, moral support.

The inflammatory policy announced by Churchill infused imperialist propaganda with passions that burned for nearly a decade and a half. Catchy slogans changed, new ways were devised to conceal the true aim — the overthrow of socialism — but imperialist strategy remained the same. It was based on ideas of the West's superiority in military strategy (especially nuclear) and in economics, and it envisioned a broad, full-scale offensive on all fronts. The leading ideologue of this course after Churchill was U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, who advanced the doctrine of a "policy of strength." The main strategic line of anti-communism at the time was a plan for the "military liberation" of Eastern European countries and increasing political and economic pressure on all socialist states — especially the Soviet Union. It is no surprise that *Voice of America*, which began Russian-language broadcasts in 1947, and later the *BBC* (in 1948), began to speak in lower registers — the language of force. Notably, the first of two "twin" anti-socialist radio stations created by U.S. intelligence at the height of the Cold War, *Radio Free Europe*, went on air in 1950 targeting Hungary, Czechoslovakia,

Bulgaria, Romania and Poland. *Radio Liberty*, aimed at the Soviet Union, began operations in March 1953.

The tactics of anti-socialist centres throughout the 1950s and into the early 1960s were based on the following assumptions:

— The Soviet Union is a powerful military force, unmatched in strength;

— The internal situation in the Soviet Union is allegedly unstable ("Soviet power is fragile, the economy is on its last legs"*), with widespread dissatisfaction supposedly present, and a broad, capable "opposition" imagined to exist;

— The countries of people's democracy are "enslaved" by the Soviet Union, their governments propped up by Soviet bayonets and supposedly lacking popular support, with the masses yearning for the former capitalist order.

While the first assumption reflected a sober analysis of facts, the latter two were false from the outset. The leaders of Western powers fell victim to their own wishful thinking, seeing only what they wanted to see. This is why forged materials "collected" by various anti-Soviet émigré organizations — such as the NTS (People's Labour Union) and the OUN (Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists) — found such success among them.

The logical continuation of this anti-communist and anti-Soviet course was the development of the "containment" policy (proposed by George Kennan in 1947), which aimed to halt the expansion of the socialist system — and above all to prepare for the "liberation" of Eastern European countries (John Foster Dulles, 1952). According to imperialist plans, this "liberation" was to begin with internal uprisings and end with armed intervention by imperialist states. "If necessary, the U.S. is prepared to support any counter-revolution

* *Foreign Affairs*, July 1947, p. 576.

in Eastern Europe by force," declared prominent American publicist C. Sulzberger in his book *The Big Thaw*.* He likely knew what he was saying. When the counter-revolutionary coup erupted in Hungary in 1956, U.S. forces in Europe were placed on high alert. It is well known that they did not intervene directly to support the counter-revolution — not because the advocates of aggression lacked the will, but for other, likely pragmatic reasons.

Mass bourgeois propaganda in the postwar period was filled with attacks on communism, the policies of the Soviet Union, and loud — though baseless and therefore hollow — calls for "retribution," "restoring justice" and so on.

The propaganda slogan of "containment" was designed to create the illusion that the Western powers, led by the United States, were not planning aggression against the Soviet Union. The narrative claimed that the goal was merely to "help" the peoples of Eastern Europe. In reality, imperialist ideologues who were openly entertaining the idea of war proclaimed the "liberation" of Eastern Europe — meaning the use of the region as a springboard for "further advances" to the East. Regardless of what it was called — "containment," "rollback," "liberation" — the final aim of this entire strategy was to oppose the Soviet Union. Looking back, former U.S. President Harry Truman stated bluntly in his memoirs: "Our foreign policy was mistakenly called a policy of containment. That's incorrect. Our goal was incomparably broader."**

The imperialist leaders could not reveal their strategic hand to the public, as that would have exposed the hypocrisy of their accusations against the Soviet Union for "aggressiveness" — the main trump card of anti-Sovietism. Nevertheless, dreams of seizing Soviet territory and dismembering

* Selzberger, C., *The Big Thaw*, New York, 1956, p. 250.

** Truman, H., *Memoirs*, vol. II, New York, 1955, p. 290.

the USSR slipped into American political literature, clearly indicating that such plans were indeed being nurtured within U.S. political circles.

Thus, Western plans for waging war to destroy socialism envisioned a progression from externally instigated internal counter-revolutionary uprisings to imperialist military intervention. To support these plans, the Western powers — and the United States above all — concentrated on expanding and integrating their intelligence and propaganda efforts.

The parallel development in the late 1940s and early 1950s of the Central Intelligence Agency and a vast, complex propaganda apparatus in the U.S. was no coincidence. The point is that the United States launched the "Cold War" before it even had the appropriate propaganda and intelligence structures in place. Immediately after the signing of documents ending military operations in 1945, the U.S. disbanded both the Office of Strategic Services — the wartime intelligence agency — and the Office of War Information, the central body for foreign propaganda. One reason for their dissolution was that many employees of these agencies had been oriented towards cooperation with the Soviet Union.

The emerging propaganda apparatus was new not only because, prior to the late 1940s, Western powers had refrained from large-scale anti-socialist and anti-Soviet propaganda aimed at the populations of socialist countries, and lacked the dedicated institutions, technical capabilities, experience or qualified personnel to conduct such work. Institutionalizing the role of propaganda in preparing for the so-called "liberation" demanded a new apparatus — one that would embody the merging of propaganda and intelligence functions.

In line with the strategic course of the "Cold War," imperialist propaganda targeting socialist bloc countries was meant to consolidate the underground counter-revolution, in

whose existence the West had full faith and on which it relied. Propaganda was intended to assure counter-revolutionaries of the West's firm, unconditional and limitless support — even to the point of war. Propaganda was to create an atmosphere in which anti-socialist elements could count on broad, conscious public discontent and agitation. "Our propaganda, both in word and deed," said U.S. Senator McCarran — co-author of the infamous McCarran-Wood anti-communist law — "must pursue the bold goal of overthrowing the Soviet dictatorship by all means at our disposal."*

Special propaganda agencies were created for conducting psychological warfare — branches of intelligence services combining ideological indoctrination targeting Eastern European and Soviet populations with clandestine sabotage and espionage activities. This is how radio stations like *RIAS* in West Berlin (1946) emerged — aimed at the segment of Germany's population building socialism; *Radio Free Europe* and its publishing arm in Munich (1950) — for psychological warfare against Czechoslovakia, Romania, Hungary, Poland and Bulgaria; and *Radio Liberation* (later *Radio Liberty*) — also based in Munich — targeting the Soviet Union. A little later, minor but virulently anti-communist and anti-Soviet stations appeared, such as *Baikal*, *Free Russia*, *Free Asia* and others. Some of them masqueraded as independent or "private" organizations (e.g., *Radio Free Europe*, *Radio Liberty*), while others pretended to be outlets of an imaginary internal anti-socialist opposition or underground (e.g., *Baikal*). Today, not a trace remains of them.

Preparations for war with the socialist countries were carried out so openly that officials didn't even bother to hide the goals of these newly created bodies. For example, consid-

---

* Quoted from: *RIAS und SFB in Spionagen den Schungel West-Berlin*, Berlin, 1962, p. 17.

er the policy statement of Charles Douglas Jackson, chair of the *Radio Free Europe* committee (a front organization under whose name the radio station operated) and simultaneously a member of the psychological warfare centre under the NATO Supreme Allied Command Europe (1952). Without reservation, he declared that *Radio Free Europe*'s mission was to "create the preconditions for internal unrest in the countries targeted by its broadcasts," and to prepare for "military support in the event that such unrest takes the form of armed resistance, which could be exploited."*

Thus was formed the propaganda-intelligence complex of the United States — and of the imperialist camp in general — armed with mechanisms for "white" (official), "grey" (quasi-private) and "black" (from fictitious sources) propaganda.

The combination of unofficial and semi-official propaganda channels was necessary for the Western powers to implement a more flexible psychological warfare strategy. What couldn't be broadcast, say, via the government-run *Voice of America* (to avoid discrediting the U.S. State Department), could be disseminated through other channels. These included provocative appeals, inflammatory slogans, personal attacks on leaders of communist parties and governments, and low-grade forgeries designed to create confusion or serve short-term tactical needs — messages that could be quickly disavowed, thus deflecting blame from the real source.

Official foreign propaganda agencies of imperialist powers cooperate with intelligence services, even if they are not formally subordinate to them. In fact, they rely on intelligence support for more effective operations — after all, who better than an intelligence officer to know the real situation in a foreign country? This led, during the period under dis-

* Quoted from: *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, December 19, 1964.

cussion, to the infiltration of senior leadership positions in major foreign propaganda centres by professional intelligence officers — a practice that soon became standard.

One example is the exposure of the close connection between the *British Broadcasting Corporation* — which prides itself on its independence and non-partisanship — and British intelligence.* The main task of major propaganda outlets like the *BBC* is to carry out ideological subversion — a task similar in nature to, but not the same as, intelligence sabotage. Intelligence services only tap into selected opportunities offered by so-called "white propaganda."

Things are different with the various "free" committees and radio stations. These are the very products — the loyal attack dogs — of intelligence agencies. Their ideological work is more narrowly focused and targets specific audiences and objectives. A significant portion of their staff is involved in aligning propaganda operations with short- and long-term "special" operations being developed by the intelligence services of imperialist powers — such as the 1956 counter-revolutionary coup attempt in Hungary, the events in Czechoslovakia in 1968, and in Poland in 1980-81. Their job duties include recruiting agents, training militant provocateurs and deploying supposed journalists to gather intelligence. A particular emphasis is placed on preparing propaganda personnel and the necessary materials for smuggling into socialist countries where an anti-socialist uprising is anticipated.

For instance, during the preparation of the counter-revolutionary coup in Hungary, *Radio Free Europe* formed propaganda teams equipped with specially designed radio units for infiltration into the territory of the Hungarian People's Republic. Some of these teams were sent in during October and

---

* For more, see: Artemov, V., Semenov, V., *BBC: History, Structure and Methods of Radio Propaganda*, Moscow, 1978, Russ. ed.

November 1956 and carried out incendiary activities in a vain attempt to win mass support for the rebellion.

In many locations across Western Europe — and in other places where citizens of socialist countries might travel for business, transit or tourism — "grey" propaganda agencies positioned their operatives. Their task was to make contact with citizens of socialist countries, build rapport and gather information useful for both propaganda and intelligence. In particular, using "casual" conversations following pre-developed scripts, they collected data to enhance the effectiveness of Western broadcasts — for example, by asking: who listens, when and where, which receivers are used, which frequencies, what causes confusion, what is met with disbelief and so on.

The inseparable link between "grey" propaganda and imperialist intelligence agencies has long been an open secret. As early as the 1970s, the bourgeois press wrote of it as common knowledge — even before inter-party conflicts in the U.S. led to public admissions that *Radio Liberty* and *Radio Free Europe* were funded by the CIA.

However, the real nature of their work was kept hidden from the public in capitalist countries. These stations — *Radio Liberation* (later *Radio Liberty*) under the so-called "Committee for the Liberation from Bolshevism" and *Radio Free Europe* under the "Free Europe Committee" — were presented as public organizations supported by ordinary American citizens. Their aggressive, anti-people goals were framed as the noble aims of the American nation.

This kind of concealment served purposes beyond political branding. As "private" and "public" organizations, they functioned as centres of attraction for various anti-Soviet forces — from emigrants from socialist countries to members (including potential ones) of underground organizations.

It was no coincidence that the press of that era reported attempts by anti-communist groups associated with the "grey" radio stations to convene such individuals in order to formulate a common program and establish unified leadership.

By the mid-1960s, anti-socialist and anti-communist propaganda was also being conducted by the radio and television services of the U.S. armed forces, primarily those stationed in Europe. These services operated over 200 radio and around 40 television stations.

To ensure a coordinated line, appropriate structures were created. Within the U.S. Information Agency — the centre of American foreign propaganda — a special unit was set up to coordinate the work of "non-governmental" propaganda entities (the Office of Private Cooperation). In West Germany, external propaganda was formally overseen by the Cultural Department of the Foreign Ministry. The "private" activities of West Germany's ideological organizations were managed by a "subsidiary" of that department — presented to the outside as "independent" — called the "Working Association for International Cultural Exchange." Even in Britain, where there is an effort to obscure the *BBC*'s alignment with British imperial policy, the Foreign Office has long maintained a department responsible for "foreign policy information," which funds this aspect of the *BBC*'s work. Coordination of anti-socialist and anti-Soviet propaganda among Western powers took place through political negotiations and within multinational organizations such as NATO and the Western Union.

During the 1950s and 1960s, bourgeois propaganda still attempted to give the impression that *Radio Liberty* and *Radio Free Europe* were organizations of emigrants from socialist countries. However, the nature of their internal operations made it clear that the emigrants were mere auxiliaries — a

kind of "specialist staff" serving foreign masters. Even so, the "emigrant" facade used by *Radio Free Europe*, *Radio Liberty* and a dozen other minor outlets such as *Radio Free Russia* succeeded in misleading not only the Western public. At times, even the emigrants themselves succumbed to self-deception and imagined they were an independent force — until their handlers reminded them of their actual role.

A defining feature of psychological warfare against socialism in that period was that it unfolded under the dominance of American imperialism, at a time when inter-imperialist relations had not yet reached the open conflict typical of capitalist society at the imperialist stage. These contradictions had been suppressed and were still only beginning to mature. Under these conditions, American imperialism — seeking to remake the world in its own image — managed to draw the entire capitalist world into the Cold War. The postwar dependence of Western European countries on the United States allowed Washington to form a compliant bloc of anti-Soviet governments that echoed its moves and maintained a unified anti-socialist front.

When speaking about this period of propaganda struggle between imperialism and the socialist system, it is essential to understand that the U.S. acted not only as the ideological driver and organizer of anti-Soviet propaganda, and not merely as the main source and broadcaster of anti-Soviet and anti-socialist ideas. The United States was the only power that possessed the resources to implement costly, large-scale propaganda campaigns against the USSR and other socialist countries. For nearly 15 years — until the revanchists in West Germany and anti-communists in other capitalist countries gained strength — the U.S. had near-total control of ideological infiltration into the socialist world. The "grey" and "black" propaganda machines were almost entirely in its

hands. The only notable exception was the British *BBC*. Britain, though lacking financial resources, compensated with the richest Western experience in foreign propaganda and psychological warfare. One could say that during the postwar period, imperialist propaganda against the USSR and the socialist countries of Eastern Europe was carried out primarily with American money and British expertise. Over time, the Americans also overcame their initial lack of foreign propaganda experience — practically, by setting up more and more propaganda centres, and theoretically, by devoting significant resources to studying and refining the techniques of psychological warfare.

That said, in the early stages, imperialist propaganda was not especially inventive. With minor adjustments, it recycled the same psychological warfare methods the British and Americans had used against Axis countries during 1939-1945. There was a clear lack of understanding of how to redirect the propaganda machine against a former ally, or which new tools to adopt in place of worn-out wartime rhetoric. This was further compounded by the sharp turn taken under the Truman administration, which had transformed the Soviet Union from ally to Enemy Number One — against whom any and all means were justified. These included the very techniques used by both the anti-Hitler coalition and by Hitler's Germany against its former allies — the U.S., Britain and France.

Just a few years after the war ended, the world was being bombarded by the drumbeat of an anti-Soviet campaign built on Goebbelsian recipes. The propaganda writings of the late political charlatan, his voluminous diaries, were being carefully studied. His methods of blackmail, fear-mongering, deception and forgery were presented in lengthy monographs and journal articles as exemplary models of mass influence. In 1955, an article by one of the pillars of American propaganda

theory, L. Doob — "Goebbels' Principles of Propaganda," first published five years earlier in the academic journal *Public Opinion Quarterly* — was included in a handbook on mass propaganda theory and practice, compiled for U.S. Information Agency employees.*

What attracted Western propagandists to Goebbels' legacy? Demagogy, appeal to base instincts, fear manipulation, use of chauvinistic and racist slogans, the art of calibrating lies for each specific context, the ability to "create facts" to provoke or pacify public opinion, to redirect mass discontent towards a falsely constructed social object — these fascist propaganda tricks fascinated the architects and theorists of Western imperialist propaganda. But they overlooked one thing. Goebbels' foreign propaganda — not the domestic nazi propaganda but the external campaigns targeting the Soviet Union and Soviet-occupied territories — never brought its masterminds the results they had hoped for. Nazi Germany tried to wage psychological warfare against the Soviet Union through radio and espionage, but the voice of fascist German radio was that of an enemy, an invader. It provoked nothing but hatred towards nazism and made Soviet people long for news from trusted Soviet sources. It had none of the impact Goebbels' ministry expected. Nazi anti-Soviet propaganda found some traction only among the surviving class enemies of Soviet power and among a limited number of socially unstable or criminal elements on temporarily occupied Soviet territory.

Eventually, the West realized this propaganda line was unpromising and began seeking new formulas. However, for at least 15 years, propaganda content broadcast in Russian and in the languages of the peoples of the USSR was marked

---

* See: Doob, L., "Goebbels' Principles of Propaganda," in: *Process and Effects of Mass Communication*, ed. W. Schramm, Urbana, 1955.

by blatant anti-Sovietism, a hostile tone, anti-communist fabrications, conspicuous slander of communist ideals and praise for capitalism and the bourgeois system. Lies and defamation of Soviet reality were reinforced by inciting slogans, provocative messages and words of encouragement aimed at anti-Soviet elements. The central theme of Western propaganda targeting the USSR was open calls to overthrow Soviet power.

Foreign "voices" sought to intimidate residents of the Soviet Baltic republics before elections: "Vote all you want — but we'll be the ones counting the ballots."

Trying to sabotage socialist construction, *Radio Free Europe* — under the command of its U.S. intelligence handlers — terrorized the people of Eastern Europe with inciting broadcasts from its so-called "Black Book." Every day, announcers read what amounted to "proscription lists" of activists — community leaders, model workers, organizers of collective farms and associations — labelling them "informants," "bribed by communists," secretly collaborating with security organs for money. "Work slowly, like a turtle!", "Slow down production!" — urged *Voice of America* and *Radio Liberation*, promoting the main slogan of their so-called "individual resistance to communism" strategy.

"Trade unions for the unions," "Autonomy instead of bureaucracy" — offered up *Voice of America*, *Radio Free Europe* and other "voices" to Hungarian workers during trade union committee elections and debates on the role of unions in the Hungarian People's Republic. "Down with collective bondage in agriculture!" — proclaimed the Czech desk of *Radio Free Europe* daily during the collectivization period in Czechoslovakia. "Remember those who actively support socialist transformation in agriculture," echoed *Voice of America*.

During Poland's 1946 referendum, Western "voices"

urged the population to reject the socialist path, encouraged workers to boycott nationalized enterprises and threatened peasants with reprisals if they participated in the redistribution of landlords' estates. At the same time, they broadcast messages to armed gangs still operating in Polish territory, listing which specific socialist activists should be eliminated. In one radio broadcast, they even reported: "The soldiers of underground Poland have carried out the sentence on a communist lackey." These messages were combined with talk of possible military intervention and were clearly intended to create tension, isolate and intimidate socialist activists, provoke violent clashes and stimulate the actions of anti-socialist elements — pushing them towards further extremist acts.

The leaders of Western propaganda during that period believed that the people of the USSR and Eastern European socialist countries longed to return to capitalism and dreamed of bourgeois lifestyles. Western propagandists — who slandered communist ideals, socialism and the Soviet system, while loudly praising capitalist society — thought they were meeting the "spiritual needs" of the Soviet people. This blindness, rooted in class hatred, combined with their persistent delusion about the supposedly low cultural and political development of Soviet citizens, made the enemies of socialism rather indiscriminate in their propaganda tools. Baseless assertions, bragging and brazen slander were commonplace.

The ideological struggle of the capitalist West against the socialist countries was waged using what, in social psychology, would be described as "value propaganda." This term refers to propaganda that deliberately aligns its messages with a certain system of "values" — i.e., notions of what individuals should pursue to satisfy their needs. It emphasizes evaluative categories that determine whether events, phenomena, facts or people's actions conform to that system of values, and priv-

ileges emotional appeals over rational ones, instinctive drives over conscious reasoning.

Value propaganda assumes a uniform audience — a "value-oriented" public — meaning it presumes its audience generally shares common principles, common goals and — most importantly — a common vision of which social system is best equipped to help them achieve those goals.

At that time, the idea of differentiated messaging for different audience segments — of assigning different ideological and psychological functions to various branches of the otherwise tightly centralized psychological warfare machine — was more theoretical than practical. All the disparate organs of imperialist propaganda waged the same kind of "value propaganda." They differed, perhaps, only in how openly they used fabricated content, and in the intensity of their aggressive, theatrical anti-Soviet appeals. Still, they had different roles.

"White" propaganda focused more on ideological conditioning — on instilling in counter-revolutionary elements the belief that the West stood with them, body and soul — and with tanks, too. "Grey" and "black" propaganda were primarily tools for covering espionage and sabotage activities within socialist countries. These channels were used for establishing one-way communication with deployed spies and saboteurs. Encoded and ciphered messages were openly broadcast, even marked in the stations' program guides. But in terms of the overall directives, all Western anti-Soviet broadcasts operated in unison.

Such was the psychological war against socialist countries during the 1950s and early 1960s — a phase in the imperialist anti-socialist strategy marked by its blunt counter-revolutionary aims and expectation of the imminent overthrow of socialism. And yet, even in these years, important shifts began to emerge in Western propaganda directed at the Soviet

Union and Eastern European socialist countries.

Among the key factors that drove the reassessment of imperialist political and propaganda policy towards socialist countries were the shifting global balance of power — in favour of peace, democracy and socialism — and the end of the U.S. nuclear monopoly. Blackmail no longer worked — the socialist world was now shielded by the Soviet Union's nuclear umbrella. But the West's retreat from its old assumptions was far from immediate.

Nevertheless, a policy shift was brewing — even if, on the surface, there was little sign of it. The "liberation" machine still clattered forward on inertia. Western propaganda still followed the same lines.

The well-oiled mechanism for preparing counter-revolutionary uprisings in Eastern Europe occasionally activated. The leaders of the 1956 Hungarian counter-revolution, mostly émigrés, displayed exceptional overconfidence. The Hungarian desk of *Radio Free Europe* was given a leading role. Just before the October events in Budapest, this editorial office relocated from Munich to the "Regina" hotel in Vienna — closer to the border of the Hungarian People's Republic — and from there coordinated reactionary operations on Hungarian soil.

Organs of "white" propaganda created a timely noise effect to secure public support and sympathy in various countries for counter-revolutionary actions paid for by the West and staged to its script. Their role proved especially important after the counter-revolutionary coup ended as such conspiratorial adventures often do — in failure. Hopes that a mass uprising could be triggered that would not only spread from Budapest into the Hungarian countryside but would also go far beyond Hungary suffered a crushing defeat. The Hungarian coup had nothing to do with the all-consuming blaze

of uprising that the West expected, mesmerized by its own propaganda.

By the efforts of all manner of "voices" and "echoes," and of capitalist mass media, the true picture of events in Hungary was concealed from the publics of non-socialist countries, and the paid coup plotters gained, for a time, the halo of martyrs for freedom. In broadcasts aimed at socialist countries, imperialist propaganda tried in vain to distort the truth, to twist reports from socialist information agencies about hostile foreign propaganda, while at the same time seeking to justify itself and its patrons. It had to cover up traces of its inciting activities and explain the failure to fulfil the promises it had made to anyone it could recruit into anti-socialist action.

It turned out, as U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee chair J.W. Fulbright said in 1965, that by provoking counter-revolutionary uprisings "the American administration did not dare to provide direct, open military assistance. When Eisenhower and Dulles faced a situation in which force would have been required to achieve the proclaimed goal, they reasonably recognized that they could not pursue a policy whose result would be the complete destruction of the world. By provoking these uprisings and then failing to come to the aid of the counter-revolutionaries, the United States appeared to the whole world as provocateurs who had abandoned those they had pushed to act."*

The events of 1956 sounded the most serious and persuasive signal of the futility of the course the United States had led the capitalist world on towards the socialist countries. There simply was not the broad base of discontent with socialism or the attraction to bourgeois orders that that course had been predicated on in the socialist countries. The hopes of anti-Soviet leaders for the existence of a bourgeois-nationalist

* *Congressional Record*, January 6, 1965, p. 229.

underground in the Soviet Union proved even less justified.

Plans to create a wide agent network on our territory — first by inserting large numbers of spies and saboteurs, then by recruiting Soviet citizens — failed. The millions spent on dropping hundreds of thousands of balloons filled with anti-Soviet literature over the Soviet Union were wasted. The internal situation in the Soviet Union showed absolutely no signs of the desired escalation. On the contrary, everything testified to the comprehensive strengthening of the Soviet country.

A year after the collapse of the Hungarian rebellion, there remained no trace of hopes in U.S. military-technical superiority that had underpinned reactionary calculations of settling disputes by crude pressure, intimidation and military blackmail. The launch of the Soviet artificial Earth satellite in October 1957 refuted those delusions.

Soon after that event, U.S. Secretary of State Dean Acheson wrote: "With the existence of thermonuclear weapons and means of delivery, and with the appearance of intercontinental rockets, victory in war is no longer possible."* Over time Acheson's idea — echoed by the patriarch of anti-communism John Foster Dulles and effectively amounting to the admission that a "policy of strength" in its former form (brandishing nuclear weapons) had lost meaning — became for a period the official doctrine of the U.S. government. That meant the belligerent tone of propaganda aimed at provoking conflicts that might draw Western military intervention should diminish, to be replaced over time by a different tone and tactical pattern while preserving the old aggressive strategic plans of anti-communism and the United States' global claims.

The huge resonance of the USSR's launch of the first arti-

* Acheson, D., *Power and Diplomacy*, Cambridge, 1958, p. 37.

ficial Earth satellite affected not only a reassessment of imperialist military-political doctrine but also the collapse of anti-Soviet propaganda efforts.

The launch of the first satellite dispelled illusions of the "hungry and cold" Land of the Soviets. Even the least politically informed Westerner could see that an oppressed mind does not produce such technical masterpieces; from people living in miserable conditions one cannot expect such brilliant flights of human intellect. What had been told about the Soviet Union in the West turned out to be plain bluff.

The most important conclusion of American "Sovietologists" about the USSR's internal situation was succinctly expressed by the notable ideologue of American capitalism, former U.S. ambassador to the USSR and now Princeton University professor George Kennan: "Dreams of a popular uprising in the Soviet Union are today unreal under any conditions."* With that sober remark by the retired diplomat who had played a major role in shaping U.S. foreign policy during the Cold War and who coined the term "containment," a line was drawn under a whole period of imperialist struggle against socialism. The West realized that all the "liberation" concepts of imperialist do-gooders rested on the shaky ground of their own fantasies.

Work after work began to appear — in ever greater numbers — documenting the irreversible character of revolutionary changes in the USSR and other Eastern European countries. As a rule, the authors of these works called for sober appraisals and new recipes for fighting socialism.

This tendency, which by the mid-1960s had evolved from isolated contributions in bourgeois political and socio-political literature into a general mood, is most fully reflected in the

---

* Kennan, G.F., *On Dealing with the Communist World*, New York, 1964, p. 14.

book by anti-communist Alex Inkles, *Social Change in Soviet Russia*. He entitled the central chapter of his work pointedly: "A Stable Russia Challenges Us." In a compressed and rather striking form he formulated the idea that was increasingly voiced first in bourgeois political and academic writing and later in propagandistic articles and speeches by various specialists on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Indeed, it is hard to imagine that in the mid and even late 1950s anyone would have said such things as: "In these countries (the European socialist countries — *V.A.*) the modest worker today has a better lot and a higher standard of living than ever before... Socialism has taken firm root here forever. No talk will change that fact"*; "There are no signs that they (the socialist countries — *V.A.*) intend to abandon communism"**; "The majority of Americans have come to realize that the communist systems in Eastern Europe are not temporary but permanent phenomena."***

The process of overhauling the propagandistic wardrobe of anti-communist and anti-socialist strategy continued for many years. The new tactics took shape during John F. Kennedy's presidency. They consisted of, among other measures and by emphasizing and inflating reports in the Soviet press about particular difficulties in socialist construction, reducing socialism's influence on world events and at the same time promoting internal weakening of the socialist order in each European socialist country. "We must drive new wedges into every crack in the iron curtain," the future president urged in 1960, "there is no need to unite the red bloc with talk of

---

* Hearst Jr., W., quoted from: *Pravda*, January 18, 1965.

** Middleton, D., *Crisis in the West*, London, 1965, p. 197.

*** Petrovich, M., "United States Policy in Eastern Europe," *Current History*, April 1967, p. 193.

massive retribution."*

By the early 1960s the high commands of imperialism had worked out the basics of a new line towards the European socialist community, described by P. Strauss-Hupe, W. Kintner and S. Possoni as a strategy of "softening communism." Later that course was called the strategy of "awakening" (now referred to as "engulfment"). Without changing the ultimate aggressive goals, it deferred the liquidation of the socialist system to a later date. The authors of the new approach aimed first to weaken and bleed socialism, then to turn its development back towards capitalism.

The new strategic line of imperialism started from the undeniable fact of the consolidation of the socialist order in the USSR and in Eastern Europe, and from the impossibility of destroying socialism by relying on a ready-made counter-revolutionary opposition, simply because such an opposition did not exist. Therefore imperialist strategists set themselves the task of trying to create one — uniting all scattered, overt, hidden and potential opposition elements, from remnants of bourgeois classes to nationalists and revisionists. The first blow was no longer to be struck openly at the communist order, which had won firm support among the peoples of those countries, and this blow could not take the form of a counter-revolutionary uprising as the imperialists had envisaged in the 1940s and 1950s. Open counter-revolution was to be preceded by a prolonged period of "infiltration" of anti-socialist elements into the communist party, state leadership bodies and the mass media apparatus, so that by integrating them into the overall complex of anti-socialist propaganda forces they could disorient the working masses.

The new plans of anti-socialist forces were aptly described by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the

* Kennedy, J.F., *The Strategy of Peace*, New York, 1969, p. 44.

Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, G. Husak: "...Gaining a certain dominant position makes it possible to influence economic policy and the content of political-educational influence, and later to determine them. All this is well understood by the forces fighting against socialism internationally or inside individual socialist countries. That is why they are changing strategy and tactics now — because they know they cannot rely on the classical form of counter-revolution, that is, on an armed uprising that would result in the forcible seizure of the socialist state mechanism. In a country where the foundations of socialism are already built, these forces cannot immediately switch to armed struggle, since they would not receive mass support and would meet resistance from the leading force of society — the communist party, from the working class, from the organs of the socialist state. Therefore they resort to a different tactic. A 'quiet and protracted' influence begins... by means of covert political and ideological methods."*

The imperialists began to bet on the gradual, imperceptible undermining of unity among peoples, parties and governments in the Eastern European socialist countries so that, at a favourable moment, they could launch a decisive offensive and unleash the politics of force. This process was to be accompanied by the secession of individual countries from the socialist community, leaving them bereft of Soviet protection and alone against the combined forces of international imperialism. Regarding the USSR, the plans of Western imperialist circles were clearly formulated by American professor Raymond Burns, a well-known ideologue of anti-Soviet foreign policy in the United States: "We must act fully aware that processes we stimulate in Central and Eastern Europe will have profound effects on the Soviet Union. Every communist

* *Pravda*, April 15, 1970.

country is a door into another communist country."*

The goal of undermining the Soviet socialist state and the entire community of socialist countries by fomenting internal discord — this has been, and continues to be, the defining line of policy among anti-communist forces with regard to the USSR and other socialist states.

Such an approach, aside from recognizing the real fact of socialism's consolidation, also reflected a new propaganda manoeuvre by imperialist forces — a new ideological packaging of the old reactionary political plans.

Imperialism strives to appear peace-loving in order to gain support from the masses and lull public vigilance about its aggressive plans to destroy socialism.

Yes, times have changed. The strength and successes of the socialist community, the influence of the USSR's peaceful policies and those of its socialist allies, were such that only the ultra-right and irresponsible reactionaries like Goldwater could still call for the immediate destruction of socialism through military means.

Official and semi-official Western propaganda no longer threatened to "crush and annihilate" socialism, nor did it predict crusades against the Soviet Union and its socialist allies in Europe. The ideology and policy of imperialism underwent (yet again!) another transformation. The class goals of imperialism in relation to socialist countries were adapted to new forms appropriate for the time. It began with John F. Kennedy's liberal slogan of a "peaceful offensive." That was replaced by Lyndon Johnson's much-publicized "building bridges" policy,** which implied setting up all kinds of official

---

* Byrns, R., "Cultural Exchange with Central and Eastern Europe: Problems and Prospects," in: *Western Power and Eastern Europe*, ed. D. Colter and K. Glaser, Chicago, 1966, p. 174.

** *New York Times*, May 24, 1964.

contacts, exchanges and so on — and using them to penetrate the socialist countries of Eastern Europe.* Two years later, this policy was extended to the Soviet Union.** A further three years on, events in Czechoslovakia clearly showed how those "bridges" had turned into ordinary "counter-revolutionary tunnels."*** It could not have been otherwise, since, as the respected J. Fulbright testified, "bridge-building" pursued the same goal as the "liberation" policy — only by other means. The nature of those means is evident from the blunt statement by the previously cited American specialist on "people-to-people exchanges," R. Byrnes, who saw "cultural exchange as a means to weaken and divide the communist countries."****

The Czechoslovak events of 1968 revealed further changes and a new camouflage in the anti-socialist and anti-Soviet tactics of imperialism — including in propaganda.

At the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties (Moscow, 1969), G. Husak noted that in Czechoslovakia, "unlike during the 1956 events in the Hungarian People's Republic, the ideological offensive in the spirit of anti-communism took on new features. In the past, imperialism attacked socialism, the leading role of the Communist Party and the ideological principles of Marxism-Leninism more or less openly. In contrast, beginning in January, the attack here was outwardly disguised with socialist — even Marxist and party — phraseology. Bourgeois political and ideological centres also appealed to communists and party workers. While claiming to analyse intra-party problems from Marxist positions, they openly interfered in matters of party cadre selec-

* See: *The Department of State Bulletin*, No. 1422, September 26, 1966, p. 1961.

** Hall, Gus, "The International Duty Fulfilled," *Nedelya*, September 22, 1968.

*** See: *New York Times*, December 9, 1964.

**** *U.S. and Eastern Europe*, Englewood, 1967, p. 175.

tion, in questions concerning the party's statutes, forms of party work and so on. Their goal was and remains above all to disorient our socialist public, to erode the party, to deepen the political crisis in the country, and to prevent or at least complicate the restoration of ideological unity within the party and the unity of its actions."*

This is the new scheme of imperialist counter-revolution, replacing the older "classical" one. It places particular emphasis on the means of ideological struggle, psychological influence and information — or more precisely, disinformation. In this form, counter-revolution can only unfold after long and extensive preparation. The enemies of socialism are constantly trying to establish such preparation, reinforcing their ideological thrusts with measures of economic, political, military and diplomatic pressure wherever possible.

For the anti-socialist strategy and tactics of imperialism, the Czech events had yet another implication. The enemies of socialism realized they could not overthrow socialism in any Eastern European country — let alone destroy the socialist system as a whole — so long as progressive forces could rely on the solid and unshakable support of the Soviet Union. Therefore, despite countless examples of the futility of this venture, theorists of the counter-offensive against socialism increasingly began focusing on the idea of weakening socialism in the USSR itself. Among the most frequently proposed ways to implement this was to stimulate and encourage internal "evolution" within the Soviet Union — a euphemism for the dream of restoring capitalism there. Our enemies hoped this might become possible through ideological disorientation and an intensification of internal contradictions.

By placing ideological struggle at the forefront, many

---

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969*, Prague, 1969, pp. 519-520, Russ. ed.

anti-Soviet theorists understood that what they were actually engaged in was not an offensive but a counter-offensive against socialism. At the beginning of the Cold War, intoxicated by their own power — which they greatly overestimated — Western ideologues and propagandists assumed they were pushing back Marxist-Leninist ideology and real socialism on all fronts. But in summing up, it turned out that after a decade and a half of "offensive" from a so-called position of strength — which the bourgeoisie trumpeted triumphantly to the world — they were faced with the reality of socialism having grown immensely stronger, both as a system and as a revolutionary ideology.

But how could they shift to a counter-offensive in propaganda, knowing full well how firmly communist views were rooted in the consciousness of Soviet people? Only by diversifying and complicating the methods of psychological warfare — which, according to their calculations, might gradually weaken the ideological cohesion of Soviet society and allow foreign ideas and moods to seep in.

Taken together, these methods formed a specific approach known as "ideological subversion."

The method of "ideological subversion" took shape and acquired its key features in the late 1950s and early 1960s. A resolution of the June 1963 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee noted: "Now the ruling circles of imperialist countries, without abandoning other forms of struggle against socialism, are placing their main stake on ideological subversion against socialist states... By all available means, they are trying to carry the 'war of ideas' into the socialist countries."* Ideological subversions are the main such tool. Designed to replace overt criticism of communist ideals and open defence

* *CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Plenums of the Central Committee*, vol. 8, Moscow, 1972, p. 431, Russ. ed.

of capitalist ideas, they aimed to discredit Marxism-Leninism, the Soviet system, the Communist Party and the Soviet way of life — without overtly pushing bourgeois ideology or the capitalist way of life as an alternative to socialism. Their tactic was to replace direct ideological argument in favour of capitalism with encouragement of any contrived alternative to Marxism-Leninism.

Now, ideas and actions hostile to socialism are disguised as "friendly or impartial" views and appeals — as the opinions of a "neutral observer" or as the ideals of "pure democracy." One goal of ideological subversion is to deceive the working masses in socialist countries, to get them to listen to Western propaganda sources and believe them, adopting the assessments promoted by those sources.

According to anti-communist plans, psychological provocations, blackmail and disinformation are meant to create an atmosphere that would first ideologically corrupt individual "deviants," and over the longer term bring about ideological shifts in the mass consciousness of socialist society. Bourgeois propaganda psychologists were assigned an impossible task — to create conditions under which anti-Soviet, anti-socialist propaganda could influence the minds and behaviour of Soviet people without them realizing it contradicted their commitment to communist ideals.

Disruption of ideological and moral-political unity — the main binding force of Soviet society — and sowing disarray and internal strife could, as Western politicians and ideologues dreamt, bleed socialism so much that it would be vulnerable to an armed blow. According to imperialist plans, after ideological subversion unleashed centrifugal forces in the socialist community and within each socialist country — once there were enough disaffected, confused and demoralized individuals, and once communist parties had lost their leading role

— then the final blow could be delivered. The adoption of ideological subversion by imperialist powers elevated propaganda into one of the West's most important weapons on the anti-socialist front.

These new challenges sharply raised the issue of new propaganda tactics. The main method became nothing other than the effort to align with the communist orientation of the peoples of socialist countries — to disguise imperialist propaganda as "impartial," "non-partisan" ("de-ideologized") information, to criticize socialism under the guise of "improving" it. What was needed were techniques to identify the discontented, find potential oppositionists, offer them a platform for unification and, as Strauss-Hupe, Kintner and Possony wrote, "give hope to internal opponents of the Kremlin — persuade them they have loyal friends and powerful allies abroad."*

The psychological warfare program against the USSR called for a significant expansion of the already numerous forms of discrediting Soviet power and socialism.

"Discrediting their (socialist — *V.A.*) system is an essential condition for effective struggle. And since there's so much to discredit, we could probably accomplish in five years of concentrated effort what took them fifty,"** — this was the confident, yet telling, statement of U. Kintner and J. Kornfeder, American specialists in foreign policy strategy. Their confidence stemmed from the fact that bourgeois propaganda had rich experience in deceiving the masses of capitalist countries through political bluster — a method V.I. Lenin described as "the most popular and 'foolproof.' Lie, make noise, shout,

---

* Strausz-Hupé, R., Kintener, W. and Possony, S., *A Forward Strategy for America*, New York, 1961, p. 282.

** Kintener, W. and Kornfeder, J., *The Frontier of War*, Chicago, 1962, p. 341.

repeat the falsehood — 'something will stick.'"*

Alongside this, it was recommended to implant Western "morality and ideology" into the public consciousness of people in communist countries — exploiting national differences, religious prejudices and human weaknesses.**

According to anti-Soviet theorists, it was necessary to ensure the infiltration of bourgeois ideas, viewpoints, aspirations and interests into socialist countries — those that contradicted the accepted Marxist-Leninist principles of socialist society. The anti-communists believed that as discontent spread — stemming from individual failures interpreted as systemic flaws — it would become realistically possible to form something resembling an opposition.

To prevent Soviet citizens from detecting the schemes of Western propagandists, they were not offered a return to capitalism per se. The entire program was presented in vague phrases, veiled analogies, unclear generalizations, references to isolated shortcomings in socialist construction and quotes from Trotsky. No detail or specificity was provided — because it could reveal imperialism's true intentions.

Earlier, we discussed "value propaganda," typical of the early Cold War. A hallmark of the new propaganda line developed in the 1960s was its emphasis on "scientific application," "de-ideologization" and "informational" messaging.

"Scientific application" referred to the use of findings from various fields of knowledge to increase the effectiveness of propaganda.

Bourgeois propaganda has, from time immemorial, been built on psychological techniques of deception and blackmail of the public, on the artificial manipulation of emotions — anxiety, fear, attachment and admiration. Now, the

* Lenin, V.I., *Collected Works*, vol. 31, p. 217, Russ. ed.

** *Aussenpolitik*, 1962, No. 11.

psychologization of imperialist propaganda has taken on new features and shades. The socio-psychological theory of mass communication, developed by the late 1950s and early 1960s, enabled the enemies of socialism to put to use the findings of bourgeois science regarding the influence of mass communication media on mass audiences and individuals.

"De-ideologization" refers to the effort to conceal the anti-Soviet and anti-socialist essence of imperialist propaganda — its real political and ideological-psychological orientation — under the guise of external objectivity and by shifting the position of the communicator (propagandist) to that of a "neutral observer." It is also expressed in attempts to distance from loud and primitive anti-communism and anti-Sovietism, from the explicit defence of the capitalist system and bourgeois lifestyle, in the declaration of political indifference, ideological tolerance and the assertion of the primacy of so-called "universal human" values.

"Informationality" implies the drive to frame propagated ideas with factual presentation, with meticulous attention paid to the selection, arrangement and delivery of facts, as well as to their combination with carefully measured and disguised fabrication. The true value orientation and actual political goals of Western propagandists began to be dressed in the clothing of "purely" informational formats, the outwardly strict lines of which supposedly defy influence from subjective ideological and political preferences. Imperialist propaganda directed at socialist countries began to assume a fact-based character.

The anti-socialist strategy of imperialism changed, and accordingly so did the tools used to support it — among them, the methods of psychological warfare. These were adapted to the ideological environment taking shape in the years leading up to the period commonly referred to as détente — which

itself was marked by certain adjustments both in the strategy of imperialism and in the way it conducted psychological warfare.

PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE IN THE ANTI-SOCIALIST STRATEGY OF IMPERIALISM IN THE 1970S AND EARLY 1980S

The strategic line of imperialism regarding real socialism in the 1970s and the early years of the current decade was — and continues to be — shaped under the influence of two opposing trends: détente and anti-détente. The final years of the previous decade and the beginning of the current one were marked, as stated at the 26th Congress of the CPSU, "first and foremost by an intense struggle between two directions in world politics. On the one hand, the course towards curbing the arms race, strengthening peace and détente, and defending the sovereign rights and freedoms of nations. On the other hand, the course towards undermining détente, escalating the arms race, pursuing a policy of threats and interference in the affairs of others, and suppressing liberation movements."*

The 1970s will go down in history as a period during which the peoples of the world — especially those of Western Europe — for the first time experienced the fruits of détente and the beneficial atmosphere of peaceful coexistence. This fact left a profound mark on the public life of most capitalist countries and changed the outlook of many political figures in Western Europe with respect to their relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Peaceful coexistence is possible, beneficial and promising. It exerts a positive influence on all spheres of life and creates a favourable climate for comprehensive progress — such was

---

* *26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Stenographic Record*, vol. I, Moscow, 1981, pp. 20-21, Russ. ed.

the conclusion reached by many prominent Western leaders. Many also came to understand the indisputable truth that peaceful coexistence has only one alternative — a suicidal war. "The 1970s, marked by détente, were not, as some imperialist leaders now claim, a random episode in mankind's difficult history. No — the policy of détente is by no means a thing of the past. It belongs to the future."*

This view of détente as a long-term policy was also reflected in how the leaders of the Western world approached the shaping of their anti-communist, anti-socialist strategy. That strategy still carried the same goal — the restoration of capitalism in the socialist countries — but now aimed to achieve it by somewhat different means compared to those favoured by the extremists of the 1950s and 1960s. Accordingly, the methods of psychological warfare against socialism also underwent a certain modification.

Of course, the ideological and political climate of the 1970s and early years of the current decade are not identical. However, in analysing the strategy and tactics of imperialist policy, it is more accurate to view them as a unified whole. The orientation towards détente and the drive to intensify international tensions — two mutually exclusive tendencies — developed in parallel and remained in constant conflict. The difference was that, in the 1970s, the tendency towards détente gained more ground within the ruling circles of imperialist countries. Under the prevailing circumstances, a sober assessment of global developments prevailed over the far-right approach to the problems of capitalism. In the 1980s, however, the line aimed at torpedoing détente gained dominance, being viewed by the U.S. leadership as a panacea for the many failures suffered by the world's leading capitalist

---

* Andropov, Y.V., *Speech at the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, November 22, 1982*, *Pravda*, November 23, 1982.

power during the 1970s and 1980s. Thus, understanding one of the anti-socialist strategic lines of imperialism connected to détente is inseparable from a clear understanding of the other — tied to anti-détente, to militarization, to heightened tensions and preparations for military adventures.

The high point of the détente process was the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, held in June 1975 in Helsinki. Its Final Act codified the principle of peaceful coexistence in international law. By the mid-1970s, all — from bourgeois liberals, who hoped to draw Soviet citizens into the illusory "paradise" of Western democracy, to "cave-dwelling" anti-communists armed with neutron bombs — were forced to reconcile themselves to the ideas of peaceful coexistence and reduced global tensions.

There is no fundamental difference between the two, as both are apologists for capitalism. The liberals hope for socialism's gradual transformation, while the "hawks" would prefer its immediate destruction by military force — or as soon as the opportunity presents itself. Both seek to "force open the doors" of socialist countries through psychological warfare methods. However, even they — especially the liberals — could not ignore the spirit of Helsinki, which was welcomed with enthusiasm by broad segments of the world's population. Taking it seriously meant recognizing that the Helsinki agreements did not reject ideological struggle, but did reject "psychological warfare" as a violation of the principle of non-interference. This forced them to turn to newer, more cautious, flexible and "softening" methods of ideological subversion.

In this new context, even the most radical proponents of "psychological warfare" did not want to be seen as Cold War propagandists, prepared to do anything to destroy socialism. Their real aggressive intentions were concealed from the pub-

lic.

Hardline anti-communist elements within the leadership of Western states attended the Helsinki Conference reluctantly, under pressure from the international balance of forces and public opinion. Understanding that the forces of peace, progress and socialism would be strengthened as a result, they formulated plans to minimize the agreement's positive impact while also attempting to reinterpret détente in an anti-Soviet light.

In Western propaganda, several phases can be identified in their approach to Helsinki. The first occurred before the conference, the second during the event and the few weeks that followed. The first phase involved attempts to discredit the conference entirely and question any potential outcomes. These arguments formed the basis for the second phase — a campaign to downplay the conference's significance through dismissive commentary. The third and fourth phases span the period between Helsinki and Belgrade and the period following Belgrade. The third phase was marked by efforts to exploit détente to interfere in the internal affairs of socialist countries. The fourth phase revealed that, having realized their version of détente was not gaining traction, global reaction began openly attacking détente, though still cloaking this aggression in the rhetoric of defending the Helsinki accords.

The fifth phase — extending into the new decade of the 1980s — was characterized by attempts to use (albeit in distorted form) the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act to launch a renewed psychological war. One of the most common techniques involved the supposed defence of the Helsinki agreements from mythical violations by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

This trend had already emerged on the eve of the Helsinki Conference. And once the attempt to discredit the conference

failed spectacularly, massive Western propaganda efforts were redirected towards distorting both the spirit and the letter of its Final Act. The core of these efforts was the demand that socialist countries "pay" for peaceful coexistence through ideological and political concessions. Under the pretext of defending the "freedom of exchange of ideas and people," anti-communists sought the unrestricted dissemination of bourgeois ideology within the USSR, the right to interfere in the internal affairs of socialist countries and the ability to undermine the stability of socialist societies.

They hoped to use détente to influence at least some individuals within the Soviet state who, in their view, might be led to "disagree, to one extent or another, with official policy."* Détente was seen as an opening to introduce "ideological competition"** into socialist countries. A new term was even coined for this — "ideological pluralism" — courtesy of West German anti-communists. When socialist states refused to open their doors to ideological saboteurs, this was portrayed as a refusal to promote the so-called "real" warming of international relations. At the same time, the global spread of Marxism-Leninism was labelled subversive, aggressive and incompatible with peaceful coexistence. This fifth phase was most vividly expressed in the Western propaganda campaigns and diplomatic manoeuvres surrounding the Madrid Conference.

The tactical line of the anti-socialist strategy in the 1970s was based on a long-term siege of socialist society in the hope of achieving its internal erosion through "dissidence." This erosion was expected to produce anti-socialist sentiments, the emergence of opposition groups, their organizational for-

---

* Lewytzky, B., *Soviet Detente Policy Today*, Stuttgart, 1976, p. 245.

** Kaiser, K., Keis K. (eds.), *Security Policy Facing New Challenges*, Frankfurt am Main, 1977, p. 78.

mation and the eventual consolidation of a united front that could challenge the leadership of communist parties.

The focus on so-called "dissidents" — a product of anti-communist propaganda and Western intelligence agencies — gave rise to slogans demanding mainly humanitarian concessions ("rights," "freedoms," "exchanges" and so on). This was because the architects of psychological warfare hoped that politically and ideologically unstable segments of the intelligentsia could form the core of a desired opposition in the socialist countries. However, the successive campaigns for "freedom of exchange," for "human rights" in socialist countries and similar efforts aimed at provoking dissatisfaction, all ended in failure. The accusations made against socialist states backfired on the accusers, and the cadre of "dissidents" — incited by the intelligence services of Western powers — remained negligible in number.

By the late 1970s, imperialist forces had intensified their struggle against socialism even further. In the unfolding Polish drama — the orchestration of which, as is becoming increasingly evident, was the responsibility of Western intelligence services and psychological warfare agencies — they began playing new cards. Under the same slogan of "improving socialism," they attempted to draw Polish workers into counter-revolutionary actions. As is well known, they used the slogan of "independent" and "free" trade unions for this purpose, under which the union "Solidarity" operated. Once its leadership had been seized by Western intelligence operatives and enemies of socialism, they set a course towards a coup d'état. Decisive actions by the Polish leadership prevented this and turned the tide of events in favour of socialism.

It is noteworthy that the events in Poland unfolded against the backdrop of a reactionary pushback against détente. This is understandable, as under conditions of growing détente,

such open interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state — and the simultaneous defence of some supposed "right" to do so — would have been impossible.

The right wing's transition from attacks to a full-scale offensive against détente, and the development of a new anti-socialist strategy — expressed in an unprecedented scale of psychological warfare against socialism — is explained by a number of factors.

Détente hit the interests of the reactionary state-monopoly elites of the United States — primarily their military-industrial complex — and each new step forward led to reduced profits and the loss of former political influence for the reactionary groups linked to it.

It is enough to point out that following the signing of the Soviet-American Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (1972), American corporations lost potential contracts worth $100 billion.* Transnational monopolies operating in Asia, Africa and Latin America began to associate the détente process with such objective developments as the growth of anti-monopoly sentiment in developing countries and the nationalization of industry and land undertaken in the interests of the people. Détente supported anti-imperialist movements and national-democratic revolutions. Participation in the movement for détente, in the anti-war movement and similar causes strengthened, united and seriously reinforced the forces of democracy and progress in many countries. The scope of imperialist domination was shrinking. "The ability of the U.S. to manage global affairs has been significantly weakened."**

Another important factor in the attitude of the U.S. ruling circles — and those of other imperialist powers — towards détente is this: initially, they believed it could be used

* *Pravda*, January 11, 1982.

** *Point*, December 3, 1979.

to weaken socialism's positions, to intervene more actively in the internal processes of real socialism and to strengthen subversive activity against it. These plans failed. "Détente is dead because it failed to contain the Soviet global offensive,"* lamented *The Wall Street Journal*. This quote from an American business publication encapsulates the imperialist reaction to the outcomes of détente. They reject it because it contradicts their interests and plans. They declare it to be a nefarious communist ploy in order to justify returning to their old neo-colonialist and anti-communist policies, to suppress national liberation movements, and to stifle democratic forces and any anti-imperialist expressions. Contained within *The Wall Street Journal*'s statement is the core anti-Soviet thesis of the Reagan-era anti-détente line — the idea that all global anti-imperialist developments are nothing more than "Moscow's doing."

Forced to retreat temporarily, the right in the United States kept détente under constant fire from the outset and aggressively prepared to shift national policy to an anti-détente stance. The key feature of the right-wing imperialist forces' actions — seen in their fierce attacks on détente in the second half of the 1970s across all dimensions — was the effort to revive the climate necessary for escalating the arms race.

Step by step, they achieved their aims — restoring U.S. military spending to Vietnam War levels (9 per cent of Gross National Product — GNP), or, if possible, to Cold War levels of the 1950s (10 per cent of GNP). To justify this, it was necessary to claim that the 4.5 per cent of GNP spent on military needs in 1979** allegedly left the U.S. defenceless and unable to assert its interests around the globe.

By the late 1970s, the U.S. military-industrial monopol-

* *Wall Street Journal*, August 5, 1982.

** *Business Week*, January 21, 1980.

ies and those of certain Western European NATO member states had made significant progress towards fulfilling their goals. In the West, it is claimed that the military buildup by Western powers was provoked by the entry of Soviet troops into Afghanistan and that U.S. actions were merely a response to Soviet aggression. This is an outright lie. In reality, long before December 27, 1979 — when, at the request of the government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and in accordance with Article 51 of the UN Charter, a limited Soviet military contingent entered Afghanistan — imperialist forces had already laid a minefield under détente, preparing to blow the entire structure sky-high.

The issue of the "Afghan threshold" between détente and renewed confrontation is important and principled, as it exposes the deceit with which imperialism cloaks its motives before the people.

In February 1980, the West German journal *Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik*, analysing the situation that had arisen in the West around the so-called Afghan issue, wrote: "Anyone who has kept a clear head cannot help but notice that Afghanistan, the overthrow of Amin's government and the presence of Soviet troops are not at the heart of the discussions provoked by Carter — they merely serve as a convenient pretext. Let's not fool ourselves: what is being done in the West, especially in the United States, under the guise of reacting to events in Afghanistan, essentially represents a fundamental shift in U.S. policy — a breach of the basic principles of détente. This breach, which Carter now pursues openly, creates a danger that extends far beyond a regional crisis — above all for the Federal Republic of Germany, which is especially reliant on détente."*

Afghanistan was merely a pretext for legitimizing the

* *Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik*, No. 2, 1980.

long-nurtured and now practically implemented imperialist slogan: "Fire on détente!" Indeed, nearly three years before December 1979 — back in early 1977 — Carter had already incorporated into his foreign policy platform the idea of an "aggressive challenge" to the Soviet Union. That same year, for the first time, "the question of deploying new medium-range missiles in Western Europe" was raised — a move that fundamentally altered the balance of power between the opposing military blocs, NATO and the Warsaw Pact.* In early 1979, President Carter, in his State of the Union address, declared the Persian Gulf a "zone of U.S. interests." To implement this Carter Doctrine — that is, to "defend U.S. interests" in the region — a "rapid deployment force" was being created. (The idea itself originated much earlier, in 1972-73, as a response to the "oil weapon" of the Arab states.) Even earlier, U.S. naval forces had entered the Indian Ocean.

The decision to ramp up the armament programs of the U.S. and its NATO allies had already been made well before any talk of Soviet troops in Afghanistan. Was it not in May 1978 that NATO approved a "long-term program" requiring member countries to automatically increase their military budgets by 3 per cent annually until the end of the century? It was precisely from that moment — not December 1979 — that the U.S. began accelerating production of dangerous weapons systems, including strategic ones, such as MX missiles, Trident submarine-launched missiles, cruise missiles and neutron bombs (which had long been secretly produced and stockpiled). And who delayed negotiations on strategic arms limitation, and after signing the agreement in June 1979, failed to ratify it? Who, in November 1979, outright rejected Soviet proposals on maintaining détente and limiting arms in Europe? So can all of this really be chalked up to

* See: *Washington Post*, January 12, 1983.

"Afghanistan"?

By the way, it is as if American interference in Afghanistan started on December 27, 1979. Nothing of the sort. It began back in 1974-75, against the government of Daud, which at that time stood on an anti-imperialist platform. In 1975, U.S. agent Gulbuddin Hekmatyar attempted an uprising in the Afghan province of Panjshir, but was defeated. He fled to Pakistan, established training camps for Basmachi-style fighters, and from there continually sent armed bands into Afghanistan. After the April Revolution of 1978, American operatives in Afghanistan and Pakistan intensified their activities — especially from the spring of 1979, when it became clear that the revolution was aiming to end the domination of the rich, that the Afghan people had greeted the revolution with enthusiasm and that imperialist plans to turn Afghanistan into an anti-Soviet outpost had collapsed.

Afghanistan was flooded with bands trained by Hekmatyar, long-time Western intelligence agents, including hereditary Western agents like S.A. Gailani, S. Mojaddedi and other CIA proxies based in neighbouring countries. During this period, the entire Western press was filled with fabricated stories about "Soviet aggression" in Afghanistan. The country's airwaves were saturated with provocative broadcasts from the *BBC*, *Voice of America*, *Deutsche Welle* and half a dozen other anti-Afghan "voices." Their goal was to discredit the April Revolution, obscure imperialist interference and cover up the export of counter-revolution — which by early 1979 had become so obvious that one would have to be blind not to see it. From the very beginning of the April Revolution, every media outlet in the non-socialist world played the same tired record: "Soviet meddling," "the hand of Moscow," "Kremlin interference." The anti-Soviet frenzy in the West was set in motion long before December 1979. Throughout 1979, the

revolutionary government of Afghanistan fought a brutal, bloody war against U.S.-financed gangs. Counter-revolutionary forces repeatedly invaded the DRA from Pakistan, where Basmachi bases were concentrated in the areas around Peshawar and Quetta. The revolutionary gains in the DRA were under threat of being wiped out. The United States intensified tensions especially after losing its foothold in the form of the Shah's regime in Iran. American agents Amin and Hekmatyar, in the second half of 1979, had practically begun preparations for a counter-revolutionary coup in Afghanistan. These are the facts.

The historical truth is this: the imperialist, neo-colonialist ambitions of the United States of America — to establish a firm foothold in the Persian Gulf and the entire Middle East, a region which today holds nearly key strategic importance for Washington's hegemonic plans, both militarily and economically (as one of the world's richest sources of raw materials) — long required a suitable propaganda narrative to support them. It was invented in the form of the so-called "Soviet aggression" in the region. Under the guise of repelling a mythical "Soviet threat," the United States has been stifling national liberation movements, attempting to preserve feudal conditions in a number of countries in the Middle and Near East, and securing positions that guarantee American imperialism real dominance. But, as the English proverb says, "the truth will out." Today, even within the United States, realistic-minded politicians understand that the "Soviet aggression" in the Persian Gulf region is yet another myth. Former U.S. Secretary of Defense Harold Brown, clearly driven by interparty rivalries and a desire to undermine the Reagan administration, stated frankly in an interview with the Egyptian magazine *Rose al-Yusuf*: "The threat to the United States in the Persian Gulf region is not from the imagined Soviet

intervention — it is unrealistic. The threat to the United States lies in revolutionary, radical changes in the countries of the Middle East."*

The demagogic slogan of a struggle against Soviet "intervention" was fully exposed and discredited when, in January 1982, the United States created the "Central Command" (CENTCOM) to direct operations of its "rapid deployment forces" in the Persian Gulf and Southwest Asia — a region bordered by the Indian Ocean. Reflecting public concern in India, the Delhi-based newspaper *The Telegraph* wrote: "It is no secret what is behind Washington's growing interest in the Indian Ocean, which the U.S. has declared a 'vital area of interest.' It is clear that the United States aims to continue exploiting the region's natural wealth and human resources for the astronomical profits of international monopolies — first and foremost, American ones. This is precisely why the U.S. unilaterally broke off Soviet-American talks on limiting and subsequently reducing military activity in the Indian Ocean, and sabotaged the convening of the Indian Ocean Conference."**

"Revenge for Afghanistan?" — asked the same West German magazine cited earlier. "In light of the above, it becomes clear that if Afghanistan did not exist, it would have to be invented (and surely would have been), as it merely serves as a contrived justification for a series of long-prepared assaults on the foundations of détente."***

True to form, bourgeois propaganda pretends that none of these facts or circumstances exist — even though admissions sometimes leak through the pages of the Western bourgeois press, such as the statement: "Even before the events in

* *Rose al-Yusuf*, December 2, 1982.

** *Telegraph*, January 17, 1983.

*** *Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik*, p. 19.

Afghanistan, we were clearly heading towards an increase in defence spending."*

It is worth noting that the groundwork for the massive offensive by the U.S. military-industrial complex on the military spending front during Ronald Reagan's presidency had already been laid by a propaganda campaign aimed at militarizing the U.S. economy — a campaign that began under President Ford and took the form of a broad anti-Soviet offensive under President Carter. No one — especially in the West and particularly in the United States — wished to see or admit the direct connection between the arms race and the anti-Soviet hysteria (with the exception, of course, of fraternal parties and progressive public opinion). Even in this case, the fact that Reagan's propaganda artillery barrage began long before his trillion-dollar military spending plan was announced has been conveniently ignored. The entire U.S. propaganda apparatus — and its counterparts throughout the capitalist world — have worked hard to keep it that way.

Let us recall that attacks against Nixon's détente policy morphed, under his successor Ford, into anti-Helsinki rhetoric — an anti-Soviet campaign that centred around the so-called "third basket" during negotiations in the Finnish capital between European powers, the U.S. and Canada. The "third basket" referred to humanitarian issues. Western propaganda filled most of this "basket" with anti-Soviet rubbish — claims of alleged "human rights violations" in the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries. One propaganda stunt of this campaign was the official reception at the White House given by President Ford to the so-called "dissident" and traitor Vladimir Bukovsky. It was then that the infamous "dissident movement" became a widely used tool of anti-Soviet agitators across the capitalist world. President Carter's administration

* *Business Week*, February 4, 1980.

picked up the fading campaign launched under Ford and became the driving force behind a new wave of attacks on socialism, focusing on human rights, the "Soviet threat" and an invented "Soviet responsibility" for international terrorism. He even attempted to use the 1980 Olympics to turn world opinion against the Soviet Union.

It was Carter who first introduced the idea of "sanctions" against our country. Confronted as early as 1978-79 with the unwillingness of West European allies to heed his militant calls for an economic blockade of the USSR, Carter began talking about potential penalties for industrial and commercial firms in Europe that ignored his bans on trade with the Soviet Union. Twisting facts, he proclaimed to the world his plan to oppose the "communist challenge" and "communist expansion" with a doctrine of "forceful pressure" and a remedy for the "Vietnam syndrome." His actions in the realm of psychological warfare against the peoples of the world even prompted the Western press to remark — as the French magazine *Nouvel Observateur* put it — that "the world is plunging into the depths of a new cold war."*

Carter, entangled by the end of the 1970s in the Persian Gulf crisis and the debacle in Iran, seized on the "Afghan issue," issuing false accusations against the USSR even before Soviet troops had arrived in Kabul — all to divert attention from Washington's own aggressive imperialist plans in the region, while portraying the United States as a guardian of peace and security.

Exposing Carter's adventurist militaristic actions in the field of psychological warfare, Gus Hall — General Secretary of the Communist Party USA — said in 1980: "The propaganda blitzkrieg, organized and directed personally by President Carter from the White House, has reached an

* *Le Nouvel Observateur*, January 28, 1980.

unprecedented level. This campaign is so irrational and unbalanced that it borders on madness — a complete loss of common sense. Its goal is to drive the American people into a state of national anti-Soviet hysteria, to infect them with aggressive, militaristic moods. This propaganda blitzkrieg is built on 100 per cent lies. No one is planning to attack the United States — least of all the Soviet Union. No one is trying to block shipping routes or oil supplies. No one is seeking to seize oil-producing regions — except Exxon. And no one is 'pushing the United States around.' No government since the time of Hitler and Goebbels has resorted to such sinister lies and slander."*

When it comes to anti-Soviet fabrication, Carter's administration was outdone only by that of Ronald Reagan. And not just because the new administration was more theatrical or because the new president had a long-standing knack — going back to the McCarthy era — for anti-communist intrigue, provocation and blackmail. The reasons went much deeper. Despite all the efforts of his administration, Carter failed to push militarism and aggressive ambitions far enough to drag the whole country — and the entire Western world — into a mad arms race, thereby opening the floodgates for massive military contracts. The "Afghan card" did not help him. As the influential *BusinessWeek* magazine, which serves American business circles, wrote: "By the time Reagan took office, it had become clear that the events in Afghanistan were unlikely to return the U.S. economy to a wartime footing." It then stated bluntly: "No one in Washington expects defence build-up efforts to reach such a level — unless there is a sharp deterioration in U.S.-Soviet relations."**

This conclusion was reached by imperialist strategists and

* *Political Affairs*, January 1980.

** *Business Week*, January 20, 1980.

practitioners after realizing that the various measures undertaken since the mid-1970s had failed to bring the U.S. military budget back to Vietnam War levels — levels that the entire military-industrial complex longed for. What was needed were new actions, new schemes that would open the door to unprecedented defence spending. This was achieved by Reagan — a figure backed by the U.S. military-industrial establishment — who secured astronomical military expenditures totalling two trillion dollars over five years, while inflicting serious damage on international détente and the atmosphere of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. From the first day of his presidency, Reagan deliberately worked to worsen U.S.-Soviet relations day by day.

As a presidential candidate handpicked by the military-industrial complex, Ronald Reagan deliberately built his election campaign around the slogan of expanding U.S. military power for confrontation with socialism. This was his obligation to the MIC, which had provided him with a multimillion-dollar advance to finance an unprecedentedly expensive election campaign. Once installed in the White House, Reagan made confrontation with the socialist community and the fight against communism the core of his administration's foreign policy. Only such a course could create the conditions necessary to satisfy the insatiable appetites of the American military behemoth, which had long awaited its hour and, throughout the second half of the 1970s, had been preparing for it persistently — sparing no expense on psychologically conditioning the public in the U.S. and abroad for a change in the country's foreign policy. Paying off the advance he had received, Reagan pursued this programmed, purposeful course consistently and straightforwardly, regardless of any obstacles or protests.

First and foremost, he was tasked with putting an end to

détente and simultaneously — by any means necessary, fair or foul — restructuring the federal budget to suit the needs of the MIC. Without this, it would have been impossible to double U.S. military spending in a short time. Without this, there would have been no hope that Congress would approve an annual increase in military allocations of more than 11 per cent, compared to 6 per cent under Carter and 10 per cent during the Vietnam War.* If we abstract from the details, this was precisely the social demand made by the monopolies of the new president in 1981. "These gigantic figures," wrote one of Reagan's political opponents, Frank Church, "show that the goal of the Reagan administration is not necessarily to reduce the size of the government apparatus. Rather, it is to divert spending from the civilian budget — aid to disabled children, the elderly, persons with disabilities, grants for low-income students, legal aid subsidies for the poor, unemployment programs and a whole range of other civilian initiatives — into military needs."**

Reagan's policy of countering détente and launching an offensive against the standard of living of the American people required broad-scale ideological support. It could not have been implemented without justification and rationalization from the government and backing from public opinion. In essence, it required deceiving Americans and the world, concealing the true motives behind the calls for rearmament and for achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union. This could not have been done without inflaming a military psychosis, without driving the public atmosphere to the brink of hysteria, without making people restless in anticipation of a signal: "Run for your lives — the Russians are coming!"

Speaking at the Rome session of the Trilateral Commis-

* *New York Times Magazine*, August 21, 1981.

** *Los Angeles Times*, March 24, 1981.

sion — a gathering of the capitalist world's powerbrokers — American billionaire David Rockefeller explained to participants the reasons for the hysterical intensity of the psychological warfare campaign. He said that "today, security policy (the Western euphemism for the arms race — V.A.) cannot be successful without the understanding and support of the public." That, in his words, is the sign of the times. Therefore, he claimed, "it is entirely natural to frighten the public with the Soviet Union's military power, while at the same time, of course, carrying out covert activities aimed at weakening (the Soviet Union — V.A.) in the political, economic and international arenas."* Psychological warfare has become such an integral part of the policy of imperialist states that it is now spoken of as a matter of course.

All these considerations combined led to an extraordinary increase — even by the standards of sharply intensified ideological struggle — in the role of the ideological factor in U.S. foreign policy. Even President Carter called radio "one of the key instruments of U.S. foreign policy."** On the eve of Reagan's arrival at the White House, the U.S. Congress regarded foreign policy propaganda as one of the "most important tools of national security." The Congressional Record states: "Arms buildup cannot be considered the only way to strengthen U.S. positions in the world: the power of ideas is as great as the power of weapons."*** Under President Reagan, things went even further.

He picked up on occasional complaints about the alleged lag of the United States in foreign policy propaganda — about supposed neglect by previous administrations in financing and equipping it. This was untrue. All U.S. governments, starting

* *L'Humanité*, May 15, 1983.

** *New York Times*, March 24, 1977.

*** *Congressional Record*, December 5, 1980, p. H.12180.

in the years immediately after the end of the Second World War, had paid close attention to the issue. With Reagan's arrival, the government propaganda organs of the United States turned into a massive propaganda machine — unrivalled by any similar services in other Western countries. *Voice of America* far surpassed even such a capitalist propaganda giant and psychological warfare master as the *BBC*. And if one considers *Radio Free Europe*, *Radio Liberty*, *RIAS*, dozens of covertly operated radio stations, the mass media of the U.S. armed forces abroad, 202 foreign branches of USIA, their millions of printed publications and so on, what emerges is a colossal apparatus flooding the world with praise for the American way of life and apologies for Washington's policies.

Until the 1970s, Washington had invested in foreign policy propaganda only as much as the international situation and the U.S.'s global standing required. Back then, the United States still held a firm position as hegemon of the capitalist world in all spheres of global economics and politics. The 1970s, however, delivered painful blows to America's prestige and now additional efforts were needed to recoup its losses — including through the intensification of ideological offensives abroad. The power and primacy of America, long taken for granted in the West, now needed defending and proving. The ideologization of U.S. foreign policy is nothing more than a sign of the weakening of its position on the world stage.

On the other hand, the ideologization of U.S. foreign policy — as that of an imperialist state in the modern era — is a new feature of the deepening general crisis of capitalism. "We are witnessing a significant intensification of the overall crisis of this social system," noted the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Y.V. Andropov at the June Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU.

"The methods by which capitalism had managed to maintain relative stability in the postwar period are becoming less and less effective."* "Ideologization" of foreign policy is one of the new methods through which imperialism attempts to resolve the contradictions of contemporary capitalist society.

What exactly does the ideologization of the Reagan administration's foreign policy consist of?

Its so-called "comprehensive goals" are proclaimed to be the old slogans — vague, highly abstract and non-specific formulas such as "the fight for democracy, freedom, human rights and justice" worldwide. The United States portrays itself as the guardian of the entire planet, the world leader in the march "for democracy." All other "democracies" are expected to fall in line, because — according to this view — American capitalism is the gold standard of economic development and the pinnacle of human social achievement, while the American way of life is the ideal model for universal emulation. It follows, then, that the United States is supposedly destined to play the role of "messiah" or "saviour" of mankind, and that its government is allegedly entitled to global leadership, with all the consequences that entails.

These include imposing military "protection" on other countries, dictating terms to America's allies regarding "rearmament" and claiming the right to regulate the internal affairs of sovereign states — especially those that fail to meet American definitions of "democracy." According to its own internal laws — which are illegitimate under international law but convenient for imperialist policy — the United States determines, for example, the direction and scale of foreign aid based on how "democratic" a given country is. The same logic applies to how it manages relations with socialist countries.

---

* Andropov, Y.V., *Speech at the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, June 15, 1983*.

Self-interested goals and ambitions are masked by a torrent of supposedly noble, allegedly classless, "universal human" declarations.

Things have reached the point where, having completely lost all sense of proportion — along with any respect for international law — the US State Department now publicly discusses the question of changing the social system in communist countries! The same rubber-stamp term, "democratization," serves as cover. For example, in October 1982, the State Department held an international "conference" on "Problems of Democratization in Communist Countries," and in November 1982 — one on "Free Elections."

It must be said that the Washington administration, in its attempts to act as the dictator of the Western world and draw its allies in the aggressive blocs into its adventurist policies, expects NATO members to model their foreign policy after the American one. "The current administration," testified former U.S. Deputy Secretary of State George Ball, "has introduced the most pronounced ideological bias into the decision-making process and wants to subordinate the diplomacy of other Western countries to it."* A number of NATO countries followed this path — most notably Britain. Its Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary have repeatedly declared, for example, that Britain's foreign policy towards Poland is allegedly based solely on ideological considerations and pursues no other goal than the triumph of "freedom."

Since ideological motives have become the main cover for an aggressive foreign policy course, it becomes clear that the weight of psychological warfare as a means of ensuring and implementing it has grown immeasurably. The false slogan of the "struggle for democracy" is declared an indulgence to justify any international crimes, to present the undermining

* Quoted from: *International Affairs*, No. 12, 1982, p. 80.

of internal stability and the entire structure of socio-political relations in socialist countries — and along with them in those non-socialist countries that seek genuine independence — as something self-evident. Until very recently, aggression through information tools was shamefully covered by "neutralist," "de-ideologized" methods. Now it appears as something universally accepted and even legitimate. To some extent, things that just five to ten years ago provoked public outrage and indignation today often lose their sensational character. The "ideologization" of foreign policy objectives has effectively legalized psychological warfare. It has contributed to the perception among many people in the West that such concepts as "state sovereignty," "non-interference in internal affairs" and "aggression" are somehow separate from humanitarian issues and no longer apply to the spiritual sphere of society.

How can one not recall here the words of V.I. Lenin, who repeatedly emphasized the danger of all slogans of non-partisanship, which are nothing more than "the deception of the masses by political charlatans."* V.I. Lenin repeatedly warned that this is a trick used by the bourgeoisie to make the masses "foolish victims of deception and self-deception in politics," to hide its self-serving class interests behind various "moral, religious, political and social phrases."**

The "ideologization" of US foreign policy facilitates an attack on the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries — a principle that the imperialist powers have once again begun to challenge. Western countries, especially the United States, have always seen this principle as an obstacle, and today, when a new method of interfering in the internal affairs of other states has appeared — via media and

* Lenin, V.I., *Collected Works*, vol. 32, p. 190, Russ. ed.

** Lenin, V.I., *Collected Works*, vol. 23, p. 47, Russ. ed.

information techniques — they argue that the principle implies only a refusal of direct armed aggression. As for all other forms of interference in internal affairs, especially in socialist countries, they prefer not to mention them.

Western politicians and propagandists constantly manipulate references to the Final Act signed in Helsinki, while pretending it doesn't include the following words: "The participating States will refrain from any intervention, direct or indirect, individual or collective, in the internal or external affairs falling within the domestic jurisdiction of another participating State, regardless of their mutual relations... they will also refrain from providing direct or indirect assistance to terrorist activities or to subversive or other activities directed towards the violent overthrow of the regime of another participating State."* This crucial provision of the Helsinki document is crossed out by the "ideologization" of the foreign policy of imperialist countries, which justifies interference in other states' affairs with smooth-sounding phrases about promoting "freedom" and "democracy." The Western media's ramblings on this topic serve only to gradually cause the very principle of non-interference to be forgotten — thus giving free rein to imperialists wherever they are dissatisfied with the form of government or the political course of a state daring to pursue a sovereign policy in the interest of its own people, rather than foreign monopolies. One step towards torpedoing the principle of non-interference is the claim that spreading information cannot have a subversive character. The absurdity of such reasoning is so obvious that even former UK Prime Minister James Callaghan, on the evening when President Reagan, speaking in the British Parliament, called on West-

---

* *In the Name of Peace, Security and Cooperation. Outcomes of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, July 30-August 1, 1975*, Moscow, 1975, pp. 17, 20, Russ. ed.

ern Europeans to join a "war of ideas" for democracy, raised the question that "Britain is being drawn into a 'crusade' aimed at destabilizing or even changing the social system in the USSR."*

The entire history of imperialist attempts to change the socialist system in Eastern European countries — starting from the counter-revolutionary Berlin putsch in 1953 and ending with the latest events in Poland — is a history of subversive actions carried out not least with the active participation of anti-communist propaganda centres. Therefore, only politically naive people can fall for the West's promoted slogan of a "free flow of information," even when it is adorned with arguments about "saving" or "planting" freedom and democracy — especially since these words have completely different meanings for different classes. It is well known that abstract democracy does not exist and bourgeois democracy is objectively a form of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

The open elevation of psychological warfare to the rank of state policy reflects the Reagan administration's course towards direct confrontation with the Soviet Union. Defining the role of ideological tools among the broader set of economic, diplomatic, military and other measures aimed at weakening the Soviet Union, Washington began openly talking about psychological warfare. This is a way to legitimize psychological warfare as an instrument of foreign policy, to deflect public criticism of it both within the United States and abroad. The expansive interpretation of psychological warfare, including the introduction of a new term — "psycho-political war" — means a widening of the goals, tasks and methods associated with psychological warfare. Above all, it is now openly used to achieve previously taboo goals — the "destabilization" and "dismantling" of the existing systems in the socialist com-

* *Time*, June 21, 1982.

munity of states.

Another feature of psychological warfare under conditions of the "ideologization" of the foreign policy of the U.S. and other imperialist powers is the increasing transformation of the peoples of these countries themselves into objects of the same psychological conditioning that the U.S. tries to impose on the peoples of other countries — the targets of imperialist foreign policy. Obviously, foreign policy begins at home.

In the current U.S. situation, this means, first, that American monopoly circles have needed special handling of U.S. public opinion — an impact on the consciousness of ordinary citizens in such a way that they "make the country take upon itself the burden required to maintain powerful armed forces." For this, as one of the fathers of the Cold War, John Foster Dulles, coldly admitted, "you need to create an atmosphere close to military hysteria. You have to provoke fear of an external threat."*

Secondly, this means that the American government is going beyond justifying militarization and the arms race. It seeks public approval for a "policy of strength," a course of confrontation with the Soviet Union. Without "ideologization," without foreign policy slogans, it would be much harder to hoodwink the average American today. Playing on widespread U.S. chauvinism, on anti-communist prejudices deeply rooted in the American way of life, on the average American's attachment to the idea of democracy — which they've been taught to see only in its bourgeois form — the U.S. imperialist circles have created an atmosphere in the country that allowed them to carry out at least part of their plans. The U.S. budget has swollen with military expenditures.

Thirdly, the "ideologization" of U.S. foreign policy im-

---

* Zamyatin, L., "Washington Crusaders," *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, June 30, 1982.

plies an attempt to involve broad segments of American society in supporting psychological warfare against socialism. In other words, the "ideologization" of U.S. foreign policy is a political manoeuvre intended to make the Washington administration's foreign policy appear to be a people's policy — with the masses feeling not only like active supporters, but direct participants in the "crusade" against Marxism-Leninism, against real socialism. This would write off many of the sins of adventurists and irresponsible political actors before the American people — and before all of mankind.

According to calculations by the U.S. ruling circles, the "ideologization" of foreign policy should also play an important role in alleviating tensions within U.S. domestic life. The anti-Soviet uproar, the mobilization of Americans into psychological complicity in anti-Soviet campaigns and actions is used to drown out the effects of the economic crisis — to distract Americans from the unmet election promises of the president. With a dishonest anti-Soviet campaign, they hope to blame the Soviet Union not only for all the foreign policy failures and miscalculations of the U.S. government, but also for the hardships millions of ordinary Americans experience — hardships tied to the economic crisis, rising unemployment, cuts to social spending and increases in military expenditures. "It is becoming ever more obvious: imperialism is incapable of dealing with the social consequences of the unprecedented depth and scale of the scientific and technological revolution when millions and millions of workers are condemned to unemployment, to poverty."*

By inflaming militant chauvinism, they want to prepare Americans for a growing wave of "witch hunts," being aggressively fuelled by militarists and the far-right in Reagan's circle

* Andropov, Y.V., *Speech at the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, June 15, 1983*.

— many of whom were active McCarthyists. Anti-Soviet hysteria, anti-communist frenzy — as has happened more than once before — are being used to target dissenters, free thinkers, and to suppress democratic and anti-war movements. Recently, these movements have become a serious obstacle to those who would like to turn the United States into a country of "friendly-looking fascism."*

As the ideological function of the bourgeois state gained increasing importance in shaping U.S. foreign policy's aims and methods, the influence of propaganda agencies and their leadership likewise grew — not only in foreign affairs, but in all areas linked to "national security." According to USIA Director Charles Wick, the agency "has never before been so directly involved in the development and implementation of policy as it is now." He claimed President Reagan wanted USIA to become "the spearhead that would energize American foreign policy."**

Undoubtedly, a key role in everything related to the "ideologization" of US foreign policy has been played by the fact that the president and his closest circle — including Charles Wick — are generally inclined towards propaganda spectacles. Not being specialists in the relevant fields of government activity, they rely on their experience in running large-scale campaigns — election campaigns, commercial advertising — believing that this is sufficient for political leadership of the country. Juggling slogans, phrases and vague promises is their specialty, and in this familiar art they see a natural tool for conducting the affairs of state. Not to mention that "ideologization" has long been a weapon of bourgeois politicians and many journalists, who have mastered the art of covering up any lie or slander against socialism and the

* See: Gross, V., *Friendly Fascism*, New York, 1981.

** *Washington Post*, November 10, 1981.

"internal enemy" — the communists — with loud rhetoric.

What, then, is the ideological baggage of "ideologization"? First and foremost, the traditional myth of the "Soviet threat." It is presented in various forms: "Soviet military threat," "Soviet interference," "Soviet propaganda threat," "Soviet superiority in armaments," "Soviet expansion." Then there is the myth-doctrine of a "protracted nuclear war," which the United States allegedly can win. To create a general backdrop, the imperial idea of the need to secure the vital interests of the United States is pushed. Throughout all of this, one can clearly see a primitive anti-communism whose crudity resembles nothing so much as McCarthyism of the 1940s-50s, of which, as is well known, the current U.S. president was an active participant, or the delusional ramblings of Barry Goldwater, in one of whose campaigns Ronald Reagan once took part. All the failures and miscalculations of U.S. domestic and foreign policy are explained by the "machinations of Moscow." "Let us not fool ourselves. Behind all the disorder in the world stands the Soviet Union" — these were the words Reagan used two years ago to justify his foreign policy course.

This idea was then echoed in other statements of his and by his closest aides. The absurdity of this idea was obvious and drew criticism from the opposition to the Reagan administration. Reflecting the views of many prominent American politicians, former director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, P. Warnke, wrote: "It is hard to believe the assertion that if the Soviet Union didn't exist, those living under unjust and oppressive regimes, where a few live too well at the expense of the poverty of the many, would somehow reconcile themselves with the status quo. I think it's equally illogical to see Soviet interference in the overthrow of the Pahlavi dynasty in Iran and the Somoza regime in Nicaragua.

In reality, much of the unrest and change in the world is happening because much needs to be changed... A policy based on the assumption that everything would be peaceful if only the Soviet Union behaved — that's a policy incapable of solving the complexities of today's international life. But that's the assumption underlying another false premise — the idea that our national security can be assured by outdoing the Soviet Union in an unrestrained arms race."*

But despite everything, in order to justify the aggressive slogans and actions of the Washington administration, the thesis that the Soviet Union is the "evil empire" was taken up by American propaganda. It fits perfectly into the negative stereotype constructed in the West — the image of the Soviet Union. It is with the help of this stereotype that the average Westerner is deceived.

"Soviet threat," "Soviet expansion," "Soviet interference," "Soviet military superiority" became the cornerstone of the entire ideological and propaganda support structure for Reagan's plans to extract funds for military spending. "Today — and for that matter, in recent years — we," noted former chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee W. Fulbright, "have again reached the point where it is politically dangerous to question the existence of a threat from the Soviet Union. Thus, the spirit of McCarthyism is reborn. The Soviet threat has become a kind of article of faith... The president has no grounds to claim that the Soviet Union is ready to attack Europe or the United States."**

The groundlessness and contrived nature of the "Soviet threat" for the American people, the attempt to turn the Soviet Union into a bogeyman to scare both children and

---

* *Journal of Commerce*, October 11, 1980.

** From an interview with former U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chair W. Fulbright to *Vorwärts* magazine, March 25, 1982.

adults, was obvious to many sober-minded political figures both in America and in Europe. They criticized the new U.S. administration for the dangerous direction of its policy. But the voices of these people were drowned out by the chorus of participants in a programmed campaign across all the monopolized media outlets with access to a wide American audience.

In Western Europe, the militarist forces — the anti-communist "hawks" — failed to achieve the same effect. Here, the broad masses more clearly understood the real threat looming over their countries due to the United States and NATO leadership's efforts to turn Western Europe into a nuclear "decoy." At the same time, in Western Europe, people are more familiar with the Soviet Union, more people know our ideology, policy and history, and there are significantly fewer naive individuals who would blindly fall for Reagan's deception.

A characteristic statement in this regard was made by the leadership of the West German Green Party in response to Soviet initiatives on nuclear disarmament: "The capitalist state profits from armament, but the countries of really existing socialism lose from it. This is one reason why the thesis of a threat from the Soviet Union does not work with indisputable conviction. Armament to the point of economic exhaustion is possible there too. The second reason: the internal logic of the Soviet Union resists this. Economics, political reasons, as well as ideology — all these factors make disarmament desirable. Therefore, the 'Greens' do not take at face value the thesis of a threat from the East." If broad segments of Western European public opinion largely share a position similar to the Greens, it becomes clear why the ideological cover for the arms race and preparation for nuclear confrontation developed in Washington does not yield the desired result on

this side of the Atlantic.

In particular, for many people in the capitalist world, the hypocrisy is obvious of those who claim that the Soviet Union is concentrating all its resources on achieving military superiority over the United States and that Americans supposedly need to catch up in order to restore balance.

"The statements about 'lagging behind' the USSR, which Americans are supposedly supposed to catch up with," said General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Y.V. Andropov, "are outright lies, this has been said more than once. And completely laughable are the claims that new weapons systems, such as the MX missile, are supposedly 'meant to help the success of disarmament negotiations.'"*

But the issue is not only about the distortion of the factual situation — something even unbiased experts and politicians in the West, not employed by the U.S. government or NATO, acknowledge.** The real issue is that the current US administration openly demands not just to "catch up," but to "overtake" the Soviet Union. Thus, the slogan "rearm, rearm, rearm" gets a new push and stimulus. These are imperial ambitions, a policy of dominance, dictatorship, the revival of "power politics" — and, as some Western actors fail to understand, not only towards socialist countries but towards all nations of the world.

It is precisely in achieving superiority over the USSR — not equality in arms — that Reagan's policy finds its meaning. "The goal now is not parity, but superiority," as F.

---

* Andropov, Y.V., *Sixty Years of the USSR*, Moscow, 1982, p. 24, Russ. ed.; convincing data exposing U.S. falsifications about "Soviet superiority" are presented in the brochure *Where the Threat to Peace Comes From*, Moscow, 1982, Russ. ed.

** See: *Generals for Peace*, Moscow, 1982, Russ. ed.

Church, whom we have already mentioned, wrote. "We are not yet being told how the government defines this important issue. How do you achieve superiority? What does 'superiority' even mean when the other side still has the ability to deliver a retaliatory strike powerful enough to destroy the U.S.? Is it really that important how many times the ruins will blow into the air? Besides, what reason is there to believe that the other side won't catch up with us again, just as it always has in the past?"*

These words contain the most basic exposure of absurd "strategic concepts" and doctrines — "first and disarming nuclear strike," "protracted nuclear conflict," "limited nuclear war" and so on. "All these aggressive, world-threatening doctrines are based on the assumption that a nuclear war can be won if nuclear weapons are used first... Any expectation of victory through nuclear war is reckless. In a nuclear war, if it were to break out, there can be no winners. It will inevitably lead to the annihilation of entire peoples, colossal destruction and catastrophic consequences for civilization and life on Earth.

"A military policy based on such calculations inevitably brings with it other extremely dangerous consequences."**

These doctrines and concepts were advanced in the Pentagon to "reassure" Americans — to convince them that in the event of nuclear war, they are "almost" not at risk, that an exchange of nuclear strikes would supposedly have little more than symbolic consequences for the United States. Without this fiction, the demands for fantastical spending on nuclear rearmament and the deployment of U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe would hang in the air. "They

---

* *New York Times Magazine*, August 21, 1981.

** "Political Declaration of the States — Participants of the Warsaw Pact," *Pravda*, January 7, 1983.

are trying to calm people down, to accustom them to the idea of its acceptability. Truly, one must be blind to the realities of our era not to see: however it begins, wherever a nuclear storm breaks out, it will inevitably spiral out of control, bringing global catastrophe."*

Just as false is another major element of the accusations against the Soviet Union — that it is the initiator of the arms race. A well-argued rebuttal to the U.S. government on this point was given by USSR Defence Minister D.F. Ustinov: "... The head of the White House declared on November 22: 'The truth is that the Soviet Union, not us, is conducting the arms race.' Let us take a look at who really initiated the arms race. May we ask: who was the first to develop atomic weapons and use them against the civilian population of Hiroshima and Nagasaki? Who first built thousands of heavy bombers — carriers of nuclear weapons, began mass production and deployment of intercontinental missiles, and also increased the number of nuclear missile submarines with ballistic missiles on board? Who was first in equipping ballistic missiles with multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles? Who began production of neutron and binary chemical weapons? Who is now trying to expand the arms race into space? It is enough to ask all these questions to make it clear that it was the United States that has challenged the Soviet Union for more than three decades."**

Incidentally, in the previously cited statement, F. Church inadvertently admitted the falsehood of this accusation against the Soviet Union. The admissions of the former U.S. senator confirm that across the ocean they are well aware of

---

* Andropov, Y.V., *Sixty Years of the USSR*, p. 21.

** Answers of Minister of Defence, Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, to questions from *TASS* correspondent — *Disarmament Is the Demand of the Times*, Moscow, 1983, p. 48, Russ. ed.

the real state of affairs, and if they claim otherwise, it is not out of ignorance, but deliberately, with the intent to deceive people.

If President Carter used fabrications about the Afghan events to "prove" the so-called "expansionist" aims of Moscow, then President Reagan had to search for a new subject of invention. The bogeyman of the "Afghan issue" did not justify itself from the perspective of stimulating the arms race and Reagan's team replaced it with the so-called "Polish issue."

The Reagan administration pressed all the buttons of overt and covert interference in the affairs of socialist Poland. This interference began long ago. But under Carter, it already surfaced as a direction of U.S. foreign policy. Under Reagan, the American government began seeking to create a situation in Poland that could be interpreted as a threat to global peace. To that end, counter-revolutionary activity was provoked in various forms, in the hope that the Polish government would be unable to manage the situation and would be forced to request military assistance from the Soviet Union. When this line in U.S. policy failed, and the Polish leadership, relying on popular support, rose to the occasion, the Washington administration was not deterred. With its characteristic disregard for facts and the irrefutable criticism of American policy, the U.S. president continued to insist on "Soviet interference in Poland," which, like in the case of Afghanistan, allegedly justified his calls to arm against the Soviet Union.

"We had no illusions," wrote the Polish newspaper *Rzeczpospolita*, "about the intentions of the ruling circles of the leading NATO states, especially the United States, towards socialist Poland. The facts that have come to light over the past two years have fully revealed the essence of these intentions. The scenario of events in our country, carried out

by actors from among the anti-socialist extremists, was long before written in the Western centres of ideological subversion. The external threat was primarily a consequence of the expansionism of Reagan's policy. The so-called Polish question was supposed to serve as a detonator, the beginning of a broad offensive aimed at dismantling the socialist system. The White House continues to view the modern world as its private ranch. The 'Polish card,' along with the use of economic sanctions, psychological warfare and crude attacks on the people's power and its leaders, was all needed to dispel the dark clouds on its own horizon, to cover up social conflicts within its own country and those of its allies."*

Imperialist propaganda played a very large role in provoking counter-revolutionary demonstrations in Poland. For years, Western radio broadcasting to Poland expanded. By the early 1980s, three times more radio stations were broadcasting into Poland from the West than existed within the country itself. Only in West Germany, there were 326 radio transmitters and 38 television relays aimed at the Polish People's Republic. Shortly before the introduction of martial law in December 1981 by the Polish government, which relied on the healthy forces of the nation, calls for strikes and demonstrations were broadcast even by the U.S. consulate's radio stations in Krakow and Poznan. Western intelligence agencies organized the smuggling of dozens of radio stations and printing presses into Poland to seize internal information sources at the right moment.

For years, Poles were persuaded that everything was bad and would only get worse, they were intimidated, deceived, instilled with a lasting sense of anxiety and promised golden mountains if they heeded the advice of bourgeois propaganda. They were told they had chosen the wrong allies, that

* *Rzeczpospolita*, December 12, 1982.

their culture was "Western," not "Eastern," that the way out of economic hardship lay not in increased production, but in demands that allegedly could only be met through strikes and the creation of "independent" trade unions — separate from the party, but subordinated to commands from the West — the so-called "independent third social force" in the country.

Under the guise of a struggle to "improve" socialism, Western propaganda pushed for the transformation of economic problems into political ones, incited Polish workers — some of whom were deceived by the slogan of "independent" social action — to support "independent" trade unions infiltrated by agents of Western intelligence services. By intimidating Polish workers, spreading disinformation about ongoing events, turning them against the Polish United Workers' Party, the government and the Soviet Union, by promising unlimited Western assistance while simultaneously contributing to the disorganization of economic and political life, to an atmosphere of chaos, Western propaganda laid the groundwork for a coup d'état. This was being discussed at the leadership meeting of the "independent" "Solidarity" trade union in Radom in early December 1981. The exposure of the Radom conspirators came as a cold shower to millions of deceived Poles. The introduction of martial law disrupted the counter-revolutionary scenario and delivered a serious blow to the efforts of psychological warfare organizers. However, they did not lay down their arms and continue to escalate the situation in Poland, calling on Poles to "resist" and prepare new anti-government demonstrations — not immediately, but "in the future."

In Western imperialist circles, it is of course understood that in the conditions of normalization in the country and after the devastating exposure of "Solidarity," it is absurd to hope for a provocation of new events like those of 1980-81.

Therefore, in 1982-83, anti-Polish propaganda attempted to return to the tactic of "controlled tension," which had previously played a sinister role in creating a situation of anarchy, a loss of workers' confidence and disorientation in the face of unfolding events. However, today the situation is different. At one time, Western radio stations managed to mislead many Poles because an internal "fifth column" of anti-socialist forces was active. Some Polish workers believed these counter-revolutionaries for a time because they disguised themselves as defenders of socialism. Now the enemies of socialist Poland have been exposed; some have gone underground. The synchronized actions of the "voices" and Western agents have been disrupted, and both have lost their former influence over the minds of Poles. Of course, Western propaganda still retains some fire and continues to confuse the thoughts and feelings of a certain segment of the Polish population. But to systematically manipulate people's behaviour by "controlling tension" — i.e. maintaining it within predetermined limits, so that it neither weakens nor provokes decisive resistance — the sabotage centres in the West can no longer do. As they are exposed, their ability to deceive trusting people will diminish.

In psychological warfare, any means capable of producing the desired psychological effect are acceptable: military demonstrations, terrorist and sabotage acts, diplomatic demarches, political pressure, the spreading of rumours, economic sabotage or blockade, disinformation, propaganda hoaxes or full campaigns, espionage operations and so on.

Psychological warfare against Poland saw all these means — even military demonstrations. In 1978, NATO conducted manoeuvres openly rehearsing actions against the armed forces of the PPR. The anti-Polish campaign included measures to drag Poland deeper into economic difficulties and to tie it to the West through economic dependency. For this, as

early as 1972, the "Hilex-5" plan was developed, under which Poland was imperceptibly dragged into a debt trap. Supplying Poland with equipment that could only operate on raw materials or spare parts imported from the West, the imperialist powers knew they could cut off supplies at any moment and the factories in Poland would grind to a halt. Western mass media actively promoted the idea of Poland turning to the West for new loans, creating a favourable attitude among the Polish population towards such loans and promising them prosperity.

In 1978, NATO sent a recommendation plan to all Western radio stations broadcasting in Polish, outlining tasks for dismantling socialism in Poland from within. It set out three main strategic goals: deepen public dissatisfaction with living standards, promote the spread of nationalism and provoke anti-Soviet sentiment. The "voices" are still following this plan to this day. There were economic sanctions: refusal to defer debt payments, halting imports of Polish goods and exports of raw materials and spare parts, cancellation of most-favoured-nation status. There were diplomatic demarches with threatening statements and demands.

Every day and almost every hour, the "voices" spread an incredible number of rumours, disinformation and propaganda hoaxes. It's enough to note that the *BBC* claimed that on December 13, 1981 — the day martial law was declared — Warsaw was patrolled by Soviet soldiers allegedly transferred from the USSR already dressed in Polish uniforms. There were reports that in Gdansk and other cities, Soviet military units had assumed police functions. None of this ever happened. But such reports were meant to stir emotions, prevent tensions from easing and create the impression of failure in government measures related to martial law. This provocative disinformation aimed to intensify nationalist

sentiment, incite unrest and confirm the fears that had been built up for a long time by the "voices" and Western agents — that Soviet or Warsaw Pact troops were about to invade. Even after it became clear to everyone that talk of inevitable Soviet intervention was based solely on the imagination of counter-revolutionaries and their patrons and sponsors in the West, ominous predictions continued to be broadcast over Polish airwaves.

On December 29, 1981, *Voice of America* spent the entire day repeating in various forms Z. Brzezinski's words that "if Soviet military intervention in Poland occurs, the U.S. must renounce the Yalta agreements and encourage the Polish people to resist." Two weeks had already passed since December 13, the situation was stabilizing — something the "voices" could not ignore, or else Poles would stop listening to them as shameless liars — and yet *Voice of America* promoted such a seemingly hopeless thesis. Why? To disguise a call to the Poles not to accept the measures taken by the Polish leadership and to start a civil war. In it was an unambiguous promise of support and assistance, though there was no direct mention of civil war. But other "voices," especially *Radio Free Europe*, harped on it constantly, and leaflets dropped by counter-revolutionary elements called for going underground and preparing for civil war.

The psychological war against Poland is the largest subversive campaign — skilfully coordinated, calculated and synchronized. On those same days — December 30, in particular — this idea, in a different form, was supported by the *BBC* and *Deutsche Welle*, which reported that "in the New Year's statement by West German Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher, there was a strong call for the USSR to respect the sovereignty of Poland" (by the way, here is an example of political pressure!). According to Goebbels, the hardest thing to

refute is a completely baseless claim. Anti-communist propagandists have thoroughly learned this recipe and apply it at every turn. That is how psychological warfare is conducted.

Psychological warfare is marked by special, specific methods unique to it, exceptional in their substance and objectives. Among such methods are deception, the creation of illusory perceptions, blackmail, intimidation and fear-mongering, provocations, deceit, inflaming mass emotions and directing them towards targets beneficial to the West, distraction, the imposition of hostile or alien ideas, ideological confusion, political disorientation and the creation of false stereotypes.

This creates the appearance of plausibility, instilling thoughts and assessments that do not follow from the true picture of events. How did the *BBC* act in the already mentioned case of the exposure of the Radom conspirators? A day after all of Poland had learned the truth about the putschist plans and intentions of the "Solidarity" leadership — that is, on December 9, 1981 — the London radio broadcast the following message:

"In Poland, disagreements between the leadership of the Polish United Workers' Party and the leaders of the 'Solidarity' trade union have sharply intensified. Official information sources of the PPR accused the 'Solidarity' leadership of preparing to seize power in the country. These accusations were supported by the broadcast of tape recordings from closed meetings of regional 'Solidarity' leaders in Radom. The broadcast of *sharp* (emphasis added — *V.A.*) Radom statements are aimed at making further dialogue impossible and placing the blame for the breakdown in negotiations on 'Solidarity.' The publication of the Radom statements is intended to support the line that the Soviet leadership adopted long ago. This line was well illustrated by the *TASS* statement on December 7. The hotheads in 'Solidarity' may now want to create an al-

ternative government in response."

Thus, the *BBC* deftly shifts attention from the actions of the conspirators to the actions of the government. The statements made by "Solidarity" leaders in Radom are, under the criminal codes of almost every country in the world, classified as high treason, conspiracy to overthrow the government and staging a coup d'état. The *BBC* dilutes the tone of the justified accusation and refers to "sharp" statements. It neither approves them outright, but nor does it see anything dangerous in them — they could, after all, be dismissed as remarks made in the heat of the moment. And if that is the case, they can be written off entirely — which is precisely what the London radio does. And so, it turns out that the Polish United Workers' Party leadership is to blame, and that this is merely a matter of "disagreements" between the Polish United Workers' Party and "Solidarity" — with all the consequences that follow.

It appears, then, that it was not "Solidarity" that intended to end the "dialogue" by removing its opponent and moving to a monologue as the usurper of state power. It seems they are merely being made a scapegoat. It turns out the extremists from "Solidarity" have nothing to do with it. Here operates the famous "hand of Moscow"! And it is no coincidence that the *BBC* — which never does anything without purpose — does not clarify what exactly is the "line that the Soviet leadership adopted long ago." Because if it did, it would have to abandon the thesis it implies — namely, that the Soviet Union allegedly took an interventionist position. For the same reason, the *TASS* statement is not quoted either.

The collapse of all Western hopes had occurred, and the *BBC*, reflecting the general anxiety of the imperialist forces, rushed to reassure the conspirators and all counter-revolutionary forces. First, they were provided with a line of behaviour,

a line of argument for self-justification — not a very convincing one, but still something. Second, without waiting for the Western agents to receive official instructions, the *BBC* informs the counter-revolution that nothing has been cancelled and they must act as planned. Let the "hotheads" not give up — let them create an "alternative government." From a news bulletin relatively small in size, the *BBC*'s message grows into a broad instruction for the counter-revolution and simultaneously a multilayered lie.

This is how imperialist propaganda operated — securing the strategic plans of President Reagan's administration during a period when it was extremely important for him to escalate international tensions. This is the role that psychological warfare played in implementing the class objectives of the imperialist strategy towards Poland, both as an independent socialist state and as part of the socialist community.

The rampage of counter-revolutionary forces in Poland would not have happened without the West's psychological war against the PPR. By creating in the country's airwaves a dominance over internal sources of information, Western radio stations regularly disoriented Poles, contributed to a climate of nervousness and uncertainty, pushed people towards reckless actions and provoked anti-social behaviour.

The American radio station *Radio Free Europe* openly interfered in Polish affairs. It worked in close contact with Western agents, directed their actions and became a hub for all anti-socialist elements, adventurers eager to profit from the counter-revolution in Poland. One of the heads of the Polish service of *Radio Free Europe* boasted that "without the Western radio stations, especially *Radio Free Europe*, there would be no 'Solidarity.'"

By the summer of 1982, the policy pursued by President Reagan had become so alarming to the public that on

both sides of the Atlantic he was being called a warmonger. Alarmed by this, the Washington administration toned down its militarist rhetoric. Without changing the essence of its arms race policy and great-power ambitions, Washington tried to present itself as a "peacemaker." American propaganda proclaimed that allegedly disarmament was the main goal of American policy. It was not too embarrassed by the absurdity of the claim that rearmament should precede disarmament by the United States. The White House suddenly remembered its desire for peace — and this happened at the very moment when it had already practically pushed through Congress the largest sum of military appropriations for the coming years. But even then, President Reagan did not relent in his refusal to take any steps that might cast doubt on his claim that more and more weapons were necessary.

It was enough, for instance, for an American representative at the Geneva negotiations to take an initiative or make a step towards aligning positions with the Soviet Union for that representative to be immediately disavowed.* The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency compiled a "blacklist" of members of the American delegation in Geneva who were inclined towards certain measures in favour of disarmament — and who, as a result, were to be removed from the negotiations. And how to explain the U.S. president's persistent insistence on the so-called "zero option" for nuclear disarmament in Europe — a proposal that even *Time* magazine called "primarily aimed at scoring points in the propaganda battle"?**

"That it is obviously unacceptable to the Soviet Union is now widely recognized," said Y.V. Andropov in February 1983. "Indeed, can we seriously discuss a proposal under which the Soviet Union would have to unilaterally destroy

* See: *Washington Post*, January 23, 1983.

** See: *Time*, April 14, 1983.

all its medium-range missiles, while the United States and its NATO allies would retain all their nuclear means in that category... The United States does not want to seek a mutually acceptable agreement with the Soviet Union and thus is deliberately dooming the Geneva negotiations to failure."*

The fact that in early 1983 — without waiting for the outcome of talks with the USSR — the United States began preparing for the deployment of new intermediate-range nuclear forces in England, Italy and West Germany, once again proves that the only real intent of the American president in this matter was to drag new missiles onto the European continent at any cost and thus keep the entire weapons production program from collapsing.

A key role in turning propaganda into a "crucial," as USIA Director C. Wick put it, tool of U.S. foreign policy was assigned to the thesis that Soviet foreign policy propaganda allegedly represents "one of the most serious dangers to the United States" today. Soviet propaganda was accused of having a "destructive impact that undermines U.S. interests abroad," of "defeating the U.S. in such regions as Vietnam and Cambodia," of "distorting public perceptions of such American institutions as the CIA, the FBI, the Agency for International Development," and of "undermining U.S. defence and intelligence efforts."** These accusations would be laughable if an entire political line — one that threatens to bring the world to the brink of war — were not based on them.

They are as baseless as the claim that "the Soviet Union is responsible for all unrest in the world." If anti-American-

---

* "Answers of Comrade Y.V. Andropov to questions from a *Pravda* correspondent," *Pravda*, February 2, 1983.

** See: Tyson, J., *Target America. The Influence of Communist Propaganda on U.S. Media*, Chicago, 1981, pp. 3, 221.

ism is growing globally, if the machinations of American imperialism and its numerous "institutes" fail to inspire enthusiasm among the world's public, the blame clearly lies with U.S. policy itself and with the repugnant actions of the U.S. government and its agencies. Can propaganda that promotes a bad policy really be effective? If American foreign policy propaganda is losing, it is not because the Soviet side is spreading "disinformation." It is losing because it defends an unpopular, anti-people, anti-democratic and chauvinist policy. Soviet propaganda resonates with people because it reflects the peace-loving policy of the Soviet state and demonstrates the goodwill of our people.

The American newspaper *The Christian Science Monitor* was seriously concerned with this issue. In early January 1983, it published an article entitled "Why don't they believe us? Why doesn't the rest of the world believe what we say about the Russians?" Not daring to call things by their proper names, nor pointing out the main reason for the failure of anti-Soviet propaganda campaigns — the dishonesty of American propaganda — the newspaper nevertheless had to admit that "the international public suspects that we are interested in blaming the Russians," and that "we just want to score another point in the verbal Cold War."*

In May 1983, a representative of the U.S. State Department, for example, complained that "the administration is very disappointed by the lack of proper public attention to its statements regarding the USSR's use of chemical weapons."** But only the authors of such fabrications could be surprised by this — those who rely on their monopoly on information in the non-socialist world and who believe that lies about Soviet chemical weapons will cover up the Pentagon's large-

* *Christian Science Monitor*, January 6, 1983.

** *Pravda*, May 23, 1983.

scale preparations for chemical and biological warfare. So many authoritative commissions of competent experts from various countries, who studied the facts on the ground, have debunked these lies that no one will now believe this is the doing of "Kremlin propaganda."

Justifying its role as the self-proclaimed global policeman, defending its claims to military presence around the world and persistently pushing for the "rearmament" of the United States, the Washington administration constantly talks about the legitimacy of the U.S.'s global ambitions. Shortly after Ronald Reagan was elected president, a report entitled "Strategic Guidelines" was published in Washington. It was prepared by a group of the new president's defence advisors and laid out the foreign policy platform.

The main message of the report was expressed in the words: "There is no region in the world that lies outside the scope of American interests." From this naturally followed statements such as: "America's strategic strike forces must be capable of striking the entire range of the enemy's military, political and economic targets, wherever they may be," or "the presence or absence of allied support should not deter Americans from acting in defence of U.S. interests."*

"America above all" is the reverse side of the slogan of confrontation with the Soviet Union. It is a play on great-power chauvinism, which is being aggressively implanted in the consciousness of the American public. Under the guise of defending American (i.e. national, all-inclusive) interests, which are allegedly under threat from "the Reds," it is declared not only the right but also the duty of the U.S. government to stop at nothing in order to "spread American ideas," "American influence" and "American presence."

The philosophy of power and American hegemony once

* *New York Times*, November 14, 1980.

again became the starting point for the foreign policy doctrines, plans and actions of the United States. "The use of force," reads an official American document from 1983, "has always been part of the historical process and we should not be afraid of it... American interests must be defended through decisive actions. If we are sure the measures taken are in our favour, the matter must be carried through to the end — regardless of objections from European allies, not to mention Third World countries."* As a result, the rise in military spending begins to look like a patriotic duty of the American people and is presented as an historical necessity. Interference in the internal affairs of other countries thus acquires an air of legality and justice.

The "ideologization" of U.S. foreign policy, in this way, ensures the revival of the once-forgotten idea of Pax Americana (American world domination). In the second half of the 1940s, it sparked the declaration of the "Cold War." Since the early 1980s, it has pushed U.S. anti-communists towards a second edition of it.

In a somewhat diluted form — for several significant reasons — the idea of a "crusade" against communism and real socialism was declared by President Reagan in his incendiary speech before the British Parliament on June 7, 1982. It was also called an "ideological war" against communism. The task of the "crusade," according to the U.S. president, was to "consign Marxism-Leninism to the ash heap of history in the name of the values of Western democracy."**

It is known that President Reagan is trying to impose American-style democracy on the entire world as the model of democracy for all countries. He wants to personify it —

---

* Quoted from: *Pravda*, February 24, 1983.

** *Reagan British Parliament Address. Official Text*, U.S. Embassy, Moscow, USSR, 1982, No. 107, p. 8, Russ. ed.

and it seems he is doing a good job. This is the democracy of the wealthy, and Reagan has become one of them — in fact, during just one year of his presidency, he doubled his $1.5 million fortune. This is a democracy where the primacy of force rules — and Reagan demonstrated that with the air traffic controllers' union, which he disbanded, jailing seven of its leaders. This is a democracy of hypocrites and liars. The U.S. president demonstrated these traits in numerous actions, starting with the "defence" of trade unions in Poland and ending with the repetition of long-disproven slanderous lies about figures in the communist movement. This is the democracy of career politicians, of backroom deals in which the interests of nations and the people are drowned. This is the democracy of Watergate. Reagan's name is now tied to a scandal that in the West is being called the "second Watergate." One can imagine that the peoples of the world are hardly charmed by the "values of Western democracy" that this American president promotes and personifies. His rhetoric, his juggling of words like "democracy," "freedom" and "human rights" cannot hide from mankind the true aims of the Washington crusaders — to push the world to the brink of nuclear war. More and more people are coming to understand the idea expressed at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on June 15, 1983, that "an attempt to resolve the historical dispute between these systems through military confrontation would be fatal for mankind."*

* Andropov, Y.V. *Speech at the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, June 15, 1983*.

"PROJECT TRUTH" AND THE "DEMOCRACY AND PUBLIC DIPLOMACY" PROGRAM AS COMPONENTS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL WAR UNLEASHED BY THE UNITED STATES

The process of "ideologization" of U.S. foreign policy under President Ronald Reagan — and the functioning of this "ideologized" policy — has been and continues to be shaped by the fact that many of the president's closest aides involved in this effort previously built their careers and fortunes in advertising, entertainment and organizing election campaigns. It is not surprising, then, that the "ideologization" of U.S. foreign policy, both at home and abroad, has taken on the form of a series of public foreign-policy propaganda spectacles — campaigns, projects and programs. Their aim is to distract public attention from the aggressive aims and actions of the Washington administration or to give them a respectable appearance, even a veneer of "humanity." These efforts do not last long and are constantly replaced by new ones because none of them succeeds, and there is an ongoing need to roll out fresh fabrications and distortions that underpin the "ideologization" of U.S. foreign policy.

From his very first month in office, President Reagan began to roll out a whole array of ideological smokescreens to cover his aggressive policies. On August 17, 1981, by presidential decree and a decision of the National Security Council, the most ambitious of these was launched — the so-called Project "Truth." The New York Times, reporting on its implementation, wrote: "The U.S. has launched Project Truth as

a countermeasure against the Russians."* This very accurately sums up the main idea of the broadest and longest-running propaganda campaign against the Soviet Union in decades. All U.S. foreign policy activity was to be presented to the world as a forced response to Soviet actions. Every measure outlined in the "project" revolved around an exaggerated myth of the "Soviet military threat," allegedly looming like a dark cloud over global security and stability. Therefore, the authors of this official document claimed, "the U.S., a country deeply committed to peace and genuinely interested in arms control negotiations, seeks to achieve its goals from a position of strength." Project "Truth" was declared to have a dual purpose: "to build a correct understanding of the U.S. and its foreign policy," and "to warn the world of the danger posed by Soviet policy."** Together, these ideas were meant to justify the supposed necessity of pursuing a tough policy towards the Soviet Union — based on pressure, threats and blackmail.

Explaining why the United States suddenly needed to throw nearly all its weight behind a propaganda war against the Soviet Union, Charles Z. Wick, director of USIA (at the time, the U.S. Information Agency), claimed that the USSR had managed, through "disinformation," to create negative global sentiment towards the United States and its policies, tarnishing the country's image in the eyes of the international community. "The United States," he said in an interview with the *New York Times*, "has for far too long failed to respond to the Soviet Union's propaganda offensive," and now "must correct this situation and carry out an energetic propaganda campaign to present American views to the entire world — to both friends and enemies... We must restore the support of the

* *New York Times*, November 4, 1981.

** *Washington Post*, November 10, 1981.

Western allies for the United States... The growing strength of neutralist tendencies in Europe has largely been a result of Soviet disinformation, of spreading false information about the U.S. and its motives."*

A dishonest campaign received a dishonest explanation. As already noted, the poor reputation of U.S. policy is not the result of Soviet propaganda. It was created by the actual practice of American imperialism as an enemy of peace and democracy. Soviet foreign-policy propaganda was effective not because, as Wick claimed, it "misinformed" the public about the goals and nature of U.S. policy and about the realities of the American way of life, but because it truthfully conveyed the peaceful policies of the CPSU and the Soviet government, which stood in opposition to the aggressive course of American imperialism. It was precisely this that forced the imperialists to feel on the defensive.

Equally false is the claim that the United States had "left Soviet propaganda unanswered," or that for all these years, American propaganda had all but ignored the existence of the Soviet Union. There is not a trace of "truth" in this — nor in the infamous Project "Truth" itself. Year after year, the United States has escalated its psychological war against the Soviet Union. For a long time already, American propaganda — in all its forms — has treated the USSR as target number one for its attacks and subversive actions. American news agencies have long dominated the distribution of information about our country across the non-socialist world. This "informational imperialism" enables U.S. leaders to conduct ideological aggression from a position of propaganda power. They are confident that their lies will reach the broad masses, while truthful information will, at best, reach only a narrow circle of people. As a result, only what the ruling elite in the

* *New York Times*, January 7, 1982.

United States wants "proven" — that is, distorted or slandered — will take root in public consciousness.

For a long time, this confidence remained unshaken. They had a monopoly on international information distribution in the non-socialist world. But the "peace offensive" of the Soviet Union — strong in its ideas — shattered that confidence. The imperialists began a total mobilization of their ideological and propaganda resources in an attempt to neutralize Soviet influence, to recover lost ground, and, if possible, to push socialism back. Project "Truth" is the official embodiment of these plans and their simultaneous activation — a forceful activation, aimed at long-term, continuous efforts to unite and direct all the anti-communist forces and capabilities of the capitalist world into a single stream. It is an attempt not only to coordinate the actions of the U.S.'s propaganda machinery. With its built-in idea of a "crusade," later developed into the so-called "Democracy and Public Diplomacy" program, the United States aimed to recreate the anti-communist "cordon sanitaire" of the 1920s, in which all the capitalist countries of that time took part.

In carrying out Project "Truth," the USIA began publishing a monthly bulletin entitled "Warning on Soviet Propaganda," which is sent to U.S. embassies and all USIA offices abroad. It contains material from American radio broadcasts, combined with analytical summaries prepared by the USIA research division. The first issue of the bulletin was distributed on October 15, 1981.

Within USIA, a "Rapid Information Response Unit" was created to provide immediate counter-propaganda in response to Soviet propaganda efforts. The purpose of this unit was to urgently dispatch cables to 202 USIA branches abroad with specific instructions on which ideas, facts and information from Soviet propaganda sources were to be "refuted" as soon

as possible. Charles Wick explained that the goal of the project was to "quickly supply USIA posts with counter-propaganda material in cases where rumours and information reports begin circulating about U.S. activities that are deemed inaccurate."*

Another USIA bulletin, "America Today," was intended as a mouthpiece for promoting "American goals, ideals and achievements in broad terms." It was built on a series of short news items and features, with "a focus on America's strengths and the positive aspects of the capitalist system." Simultaneously, it was meant to "draw attention to the weaknesses of Marxist societies."** This publication was designed, in the eyes of its architects, to become an encyclopedia of anti-communist, anti-socialist and anti-Soviet distortions — a reference manual of hypocrisy and moral posturing from capitalism's apologists, particularly the American variety.

According to the authors and sponsors of Project "Truth," its implementation was to result in the world being flooded with American propaganda output — all of it exclusively anti-communist and anti-Soviet in nature. The aim was to drown out the voice of truth carried by Soviet propaganda, to distract public attention from criticism of American imperialism. A key component of the project was the effort to bury the idea of peaceful coexistence and to condition global opinion into accepting the inevitability of war.

Tasked with executing the project and coordinating a "vigorous information campaign outside the United States," USIA (then known as USICA) was granted the authority to request relevant "data" from the Department of State, the Department of Defense and the Central Intelligence Agency. These and other government agencies were required to

* *New York Times*, November 4, 1982.

** *Washington Post*, November 10, 1982.

cooperate with USIA and to "declassify and provide materials relevant to this campaign."*

Decoding this section of the document, we see that it was not referring to some mysterious "secret" data about the Soviet Union's "sinister" intentions and actions. Such documents did not exist. The secrecy surrounding the information supplied to USIA lay in the fact that no outsider should know who, how or where it was being fabricated. The real point of this clause, which obligated all U.S. agencies engaged in external affairs to provide USIA with "materials related to the campaign," was that it expanded the number of institutions involved in producing anti-Soviet forgeries. What had previously been the exclusive domain of USIA now became the responsibility of many other agencies.

To ensure their cooperation, a presidential directive established an interdepartmental commission to oversee and execute the entire campaign. It was chaired by the USIA director, with his deputy heading the administrative committee responsible for daily operations. The project was granted full access to USIA's resources, as well as any additional assets deemed necessary for use both domestically and abroad.

It's worth noting that this directive was enthusiastically carried out by the Department of Defense, the State Department, the Agency for International Development and — of course — the Central Intelligence Agency.

The most notorious fabrication to emerge under the joint departmental efforts of Project "Truth" was the second edition of the brochure *Soviet Military Power*, which TASS justly dubbed the "second edition of lies." It was a fitting offspring of this pseudo-"truth." Publicly promoted at the highest levels, this brochure — produced by the U.S. Department of Defense and handed over to USIA for distribution — was

* *New York Times*, November 4, 1982.

designed to undermine support for the Soviet Union's "peace offensive," which had gained traction on both sides of the Atlantic. It sought to pin the blame for the arms race on the USSR and to paint it as bent on world domination. At the same time, it served to bolster the Reagan administration's flimsy rationale for endless increases in U.S. military spending.

Despite a well-funded publicity campaign, the brochure failed to deceive peace advocates. In a special report by the Washington-based Centre for Defence Information, retired Rear Admiral Gene La Rocque, the organization's director, stated that the brochure "contains unsubstantiated claims, misleading graphics and panic-driven assumptions. It was released by the administration to frighten Americans who oppose the U.S. policy of massive arms buildup and to justify the Pentagon's plan to spend two trillion dollars on military programs." The report concluded that the so-called "new information" about "Soviet military power" in the Pentagon brochure was merely a rehash of previous slanderous claims by official Washington.

Even the bourgeois press in Western Europe saw through the "declassified" Pentagon data presented for Project "Truth." As the French newspaper *Le Monde* wrote, the brochure's goal was "to secure another increase in military appropriations... The Pentagon presented a deliberately alarming image of Soviet military power." The elegant language didn't stop the paper from calling a spade a spade: this was a fraudulent fabrication.

The psychological war waged against our country since the Great October Socialist Revolution has seen many such fabrications. The infamous "Comintern Letter" became a textbook example of a forged document used by global capitalism in the mid-1920s to try to strip the Soviet Union of

support from progressive forces in the West, to divide the international communist movement and to justify the outbreak of what we now call the "Cold War" against socialism. Today's anti-communists — who have elevated psychological warfare into a form of strategic weaponry — are simply retracing old steps. Yet in their campaign to discredit the Soviet Union and its peaceful foreign policy, they continue to churn out one fabrication after another.

One of the most sensational anti-Soviet forgeries of the early 1980s was the accusation that the USSR used chemical weapons in Afghanistan and Southeast Asia. This was no tabloid rumour — it came directly from a senior official: U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig. In 1980, the U.S. pushed the UN to create a panel of chemical weapons experts to back up its slanderous claims. Washington was confident that its intelligence services had manufactured enough "evidence" and prepped enough "witnesses" to ensure everything would go smoothly. But after two years of investigation, the UN group concluded that it was impossible to verify the allegations made by the U.S. Secretary of State — claims that had been echoed repeatedly by other American officials, including President Reagan.

Even America's allies distanced themselves from this official forgery. A recently published report by Australia's Department of Defence stated outright that the samples of "poisoned" leaves sent from Laos were "fakes." Similar conclusions were drawn in reports compiled by scientists in other countries. The forgery was dealt a major blow by the testimony of several leading American scientists, who declared that the Reagan administration's claims were "completely unfounded" and "entirely unsubstantiated."* It turned out, for example, that the infamous "yellow rain" allegedly sprayed

* *New York Times*, June 21, 1983.

by the Soviets in Indochina was also present in the United States — it was nothing more than bee droppings containing partially digested pollen. More evidence began to emerge debunking Washington's official lies — and the propaganda machine it had unleashed began to backfire like a boomerang. This propaganda blitzkrieg, intended as a massive ideological strike aimed at quick results — while ignoring potential side effects — became a hallmark tactic of the "ideologized" foreign policy pursued by the U.S. government in the first half of the 1980s.

This characteristic example reveals many aspects of such "ideologization." It clearly illustrates the involvement of the highest echelons of power in psychological warfare. The multifaceted weakening of the United States' global position made the usual channels for promoting the administration's ideas and slogans — via press secretaries, State Department officials, White House representatives and other governmental bodies — insufficient. The Reagan administration began to directly involve itself in drawing public attention to the ideas intended to justify, legitimize and support its foreign policy course. This involvement aimed to give the administration's arguments greater weight and activate mechanisms typical of commercial advertising.

At the same time, this approach served to underline the administration's supposed "commitment" to its proclaimed course — its tireless struggle against the enemies of the "American dream," its defence of "American ideals" and its efforts to spread them worldwide. This sustained the artificially inflated image of the Reagan administration as strong and dynamic, confident in its power and in its ability to fulfil declared plans. This is nothing more than an appeal to American nationalism — a calculated attempt to appeal to the chauvinistic tendencies of the average American citizen,

and to relieve the perceived "national humiliation" associated with the failure of the Vietnam adventure and, later, the evident impotence of Washington in securing the release of U.S. embassy hostages in Tehran.

Sanctifying these ideas with the authority of the nation's leaders, the Reagan team sought to emphasize the supposedly noble aspirations of the White House and thereby enlist public support. Thus, the "big lie" of American imperialism was not only shielded by the prestige of government officials — whom ordinary Americans were conditioned to trust due to their positions — but was also incorporated into a set of "truths" that many Americans see as part of their national heritage, such as "democracy," "freedom," and so on.

The slander surrounding the so-called "Soviet military threat" and "Soviet chemical weapons" demonstrates how the "big lie" became a key element in imperialist strategy — not only to provide general justification for the aggressive and militaristic course of the U.S. government, but also to serve as a trigger for specific programs and initiatives.

Almost every new anti-Soviet "initiative" from the Reagan administration — accusing the USSR of violating international law, bilateral agreements, etc. — signalled the U.S. intention to commit precisely the same types of violations.

Take, for example, the claim of the USSR's "imaginary superiority" in the field of armaments. This narrative emerged before Washington even presented its "rearmament" plan to the public. Raising the issue laid the groundwork for skyrocketing expenditures on dozens of costly military programs — a windfall for the largest American corporations.

The same was true of the accusations regarding Soviet "chemical weapons." These weren't merely aimed at stoking anti-Soviet sentiment or strengthening the ideological position of imperialism. The motives were simple: In early

1982, nearly a year after Haig's allegations, President Reagan announced his intention to launch a chemical rearmament program. And yet, by that time, the United States already possessed the world's largest chemical weapons arsenal — enough to exterminate the planet's population multiple times over. But stockpiled weapons represent dead capital; they generate no profit for monopolies. Reagan, therefore, moved to ensure that chemical corporations received their slice of the military budget pie. Naturally, Pentagon generals were involved as well.

The Reagan administration has continued using this propaganda tactic — despite its repeated discrediting and the many exposures that have followed such efforts. They continue to act on the core principle of psychological warfare: "Lie big and lie often, until it's believed." Given the dominance of American — and aligned British and French — sources of international news in the non-socialist world, the U.S. has been largely successful in insulating the public from truthful information and muting the impact of exposés. A significant part of the damage is offset by the prestige of the administration. Long-standing psychological mechanisms take effect — traditional reverence for the presidency, American nationalism and chauvinism. The Reagan team, well-versed in manipulating mass consciousness, skilfully exploits this social psychology. This is evident in the fact that President Reagan continues to repeat his usual string of anti-Soviet fabrications even when left entirely alone in doing so. Such was the case with the topic of "Soviet chemical weapons" in Afghanistan and Southeast Asia, when even *The Wall Street Journal* — which had first sounded the alarm on these so-called "Soviet crimes against humanity" — was eventually forced to admit that the entire narrative had been concocted by the Washington administration.

The entire structure of psychological warfare as a tool of modern imperialist strategy relies on a series of interwoven propaganda campaigns of this kind — and it's often difficult to separate one campaign from the next. The "human rights in socialist countries" campaign was followed by accusations that the Soviet Union encouraged international terrorism. Then came the "Afghan question," the "Soviet military threat" and "Soviet chemical weapons." Depending on the developments of the moment, the needs of the U.S. military-industrial complex and the goals of the monopolies that dictate government policy, new fabricated campaigns appear: claims that the USSR violated the SALT II treaty (which the U.S. never ratified and has violated itself with its MX missile program, while hypocritically shouting "stop thief!"), or that the USSR is "militarizing space" (a campaign designed to clear the way for America's own space militarization plans).

Project "Truth" was conceived precisely to ensure that these campaigns would unfold in a coordinated, vigorous fashion, using the full force of American informational power, maintaining intensity and reaching every corner of the globe. But despite the energy behind Project "Truth," it failed to achieve the desired effect. U.S. prestige continued to decline, the anti-war movement gained momentum, allies became increasingly obstinate and independent and the Soviet Union resolutely pursued its "peace offensive." The idea of peaceful coexistence could not be buried. As a result of the U.S. president's aggressive rhetoric, accompanied by a flood of "evidence" of the supposed acceptability — even "benefits" — of nuclear war, Reagan gained a reputation throughout the world, especially in Western Europe, as a warmonger. His advisers decided that both his personal authority and the goals of his administration needed rescuing. They sought to neutralize the damaging effects of his nuclear saber-rattling.

Reagan travelled to Europe to "charm" the Western Europeans — to make them forget that, not long ago, he had so casually discussed the prospect of a "protracted nuclear war," in which Western Europe would be the first casualty. Without changing his arms-race policy or imperial ambitions in the slightest, Reagan now wished to be seen as a "peacemaker" and a wise helmsman of the Western world. It's perhaps no coincidence that *Time* magazine at the time referred to Reagan as "the most powerful statesman on the planet," "the great leader of the entire free world."*

Reagan's now-famous speech in the British Parliament on June 7, 1982 can rightly be seen as a new phase in his "ideologized" foreign policy.

Attempting to present himself to Europeans as the natural ideological leader of the capitalist world — a kind of "Western messiah" — he proposed an "alternative" to Marxism-Leninism, calling for a "new democratic revolution." According to him, "democracy" (naturally, bourgeois democracy) was the key thing the world's peoples needed — and without it, peace had no meaning. It is not difficult to see the deeper implication: Reagan's call to "achieve democracy" in socialist and developing countries was in fact a veiled justification for militarism. In this way, he laid a "democratic" foundation for the idea of a "limited," "protracted" or "preventive" war. Consequently, the concept of peaceful coexistence is rendered meaningless — because it implies the existence of countries where people live outside of bourgeois democracy. The idea of inevitable nuclear confrontation is normalized. One is reminded of the shameless remark: "There are things more important than peace," casually thrown out in a speech by former U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig. It appears that this line of thinking had been under discussion in the White

* *Time*, June 14, 1982.

House for some time — Haig's statement was no slip of the tongue. This is also confirmed by Charles Wick's remarks that the U.S. is "at war" with the Soviet Union and by the numerous belligerent declarations from then-NSC staffer Richard Pipes, such as his claim that if the USSR didn't change its behaviour, it would have to change its system.

In London, Reagan proclaimed a "crusade for freedom and democracy." This was not only a formal declaration of psychological war against socialism, but also a call to all capitalist states to hitch themselves to the American anti-communist wagon. It was a logical continuation of Project "Truth" — an attempt to salvage, if not the project itself, then its core idea by expanding its scope and boosting its propaganda resources and implementation potential.

It must be said that Reagan's naïve rhetoric was quickly exposed in Western Europe. The public correctly interpreted the declaration of a "crusade for freedom" as a call for systemic change in the socialist countries. Also recognized were the clumsy attempts of the American president to drag Western Europeans into actions contrary to their own interests, all in the name of achieving America's global ambitions. Among Western European governments, only the British Tories — through the words of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher — repeatedly confirmed their willingness to participate in this "crusade" using mass propaganda tools "unprecedented in their scale." Yet even the conservative government of the United Kingdom did not go beyond standard anti-communist rhetoric.

The failure of the United States to derail the long-term economic cooperation plan between the USSR and Western European countries under the "gas-for-pipes" project clearly revealed the dividing line between the U.S. and its NATO allies. Reagan's policy of strict economic sanctions — out-

wardly justified by "ideological" considerations and declared as "punishment" for socialism's "undemocratic" way of life — was, in fact, aimed primarily at deteriorating the international climate and derailing détente in Europe. Reagan's strategy sought to divert Western Europeans away from "European economic thinking" and "European nationalism," and steer them towards "Atlantic military thinking" and "Atlantic unity." In addition to anti-communism and inter-imperialist competition, the Reagan sanctions were driven by the same goal — to create a smokescreen over the arms race and the preparation of military ventures. The so-called "sanctions" of President Reagan were merely another way of inserting the "big lie" about the Soviet Union and about the true intentions of U.S. imperialism into the consciousness of nations. This was an integral part of imperialism's psychological war against the USSR.

To implement the president's declared plans for "ideological war" against socialism, the U.S. State Department held a series of international meetings, conferences, symposia and seminars. These gatherings were used to formulate propaganda theses, refine arguments and counter-arguments and arrive at unified assessments, which would then become the basis for the anti-Soviet, anti-socialist policy of "encouraging democratic change." What else can this be called but open, state-level attempts to export counter-revolution — in the most blatant and unapologetic form, a violation of international law. Above all, it signified a disregard for agreements that the U.S. government had signed repeatedly with the USSR, committing to refrain from subversive actions against one another.

The colours that once decorated the "Truth" campaign faded quietly, and mention of it gradually disappeared from the pages of American newspapers and the speeches of Amer-

ican politicians. To launch a broader campaign — surpassing even "Truth" — for a "crusade," a higher-level body was created, replacing Charles Wick's coordination committee. By Presidential Directive No. 77, issued in late January 1983, the Cabinet-Level Planning Committee for Propaganda was established, chaired by National Security Advisor William Clark. Unlike Wick's interagency committee, which served mainly a coordinating role and focused on extracting materials from various agencies, Clark's committee was directive in nature. It functioned much like the U.S. government's wartime Committee on Public Information — centralizing all foreign policy propaganda efforts and ensuring that domestic propaganda harmonized with external messaging. This was reflected in the structure of the committee itself. While Wick had been a general without an army, Clark's committee had four working subcommittees: on international information, international policy, international broadcasting and public organizations (the last aimed at the widest possible engagement of civic groups and private resources in support of government-led psychological warfare).

To maintain momentum for the "crusade" and reinforce its idea, U.S. ruling circles continually rolled out new propaganda initiatives, declarations, appeals — and, of course, new funding. The main such initiative was the "Democracy and Public Diplomacy" program, published by the State Department in early February 1983. Behind its elaborate title lay the same familiar aim: to justify interference in the internal affairs of countries whose political systems or domestic/foreign policies did not align with Washington's preferences. The idea was simple: the United States would openly appeal to the world to fight for democracy — presented as the highest value. Their policy would be "transparent," maintaining diplomatic relations with peoples and refraining from "propaganda."

This idea, it seems, had been gradually taking shape — fuelled by the administration's growing conviction that Project "Truth" was proving ineffective. One of its main shortcomings, from a global imperialist perspective, was that it addressed only a portion of the conflict between imperialism and socialism. It failed, for example, to address ideological and political expansion in developing countries. This was a critical omission for the West as those nations were seen as the true reserve of capitalism — just as colonial empires had once been. The loss of control over the so-called "Third World" had weakened imperialism, particularly American imperialism, increasing Washington's need to fight more aggressively for ideological influence in developing countries. Too many of these countries had fallen out of the capitalist orbit or saw ties with socialist states as a way to strengthen their independence.

The Reagan administration's expansionist agenda required a broader ideological framework — the creation of global ideological spheres that would bring in allies and the rest of the capitalist world. Washington needed more aggressive slogans and ideas to cover the world with a "big lie," secure a free hand against socialist and developing nations and rally all reactionary forces under the anti-communist banner — including those tricked into joining through propaganda.

Back in October 1982, Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights Elliott Abrams held a press conference for foreign journalists, where he announced the administration's determination to sharply intensify the campaign to "strengthen global democracy." This effort was closely linked to Project "Truth." It was here that Reagan's June 1982 speech to the British Parliament was first officially cited as the launch point of the campaign. Later, in spring 1983, it emerged that the idea behind the "Democracy and Public Diplomacy"

program belonged to John Lenczowski, appointed in March 1983 as Reagan's advisor on Soviet affairs. Lenczowski had outlined the core concept back in 1981 in an article published in *Policy Review*, a journal by the Heritage Foundation. Later, with input from co-authors at the U.S. National Security Council, this concept evolved into the program that formed the basis for Presidential Directive No. 77.

So, what was the idea that so captivated the president? Lenczowski wrote that the core of the East-West conflict lay in irreconcilable ideological contradictions. He claimed that a "decline in values and moral demoralization" had damaged the United States and called for an "ideological offensive to defend our ideals of freedom, development, social mobility and law and order — with the support of all of society." According to Lenczowski, the key tool for achieving this goal was the export of American ideals through public diplomacy. It's no surprise that this young anti-communist intellectual gained favour in the White House. His theorizing matched Reagan's worldview and helped fill the ideological vacuum that the president struggled to cover, enabling him to appear as a wise captain of both America and the capitalist world. Thus, these ideas became the foundation of the "Democracy and Public Diplomacy" program, which underwent refinement in the autumn of 1982.

In October-November 1982, a series of closed-door conferences were held — with the involvement of the State Department, other government agencies and the American Enterprise Institute — to discuss specific steps for intensifying ideological subversion against socialist countries. As Abrams himself later noted, they discussed the creation of new bodies to support ideological sabotage, as well as proposals to engage the so-called "public" in psychological warfare.

The idea was to establish a public institution in the U.S.

— similar to a "German political foundation" — that would, as Abrams put it, "study the paths and methods for democratizing societies." Knowing the nature of the "foundation" he had in mind, it's clear that the State Department was looking to create a new institution for organizing and carrying out propaganda sabotage against socialist states.

When they referred to "public" organizations to be involved in promoting democracy, it became clear they meant various pseudo-private and so-called "non-governmental" organizations and foundations. This was an old psychological warfare tactic dating back to the 1940s and 1950s, when the CIA mass-produced such organizations in the U.S. and abroad — used as "fronts" for covert operations. Let us recall that *Radio Free Europe* and *Radio Liberty* (originally *Liberation*) were the largest CIA fronts — and remain so to this day. Despite repeated exposés, they continue to be branded as "non-governmental" organizations, though they are funded from the U.S. budget and overseen by the Board for International Broadcasting, an agency controlled by the White House. The general idea behind all this was to lend Reagan's plans and actions the appearance of broad public support (recall Lenczowski: "an offensive for our ideals based on the support of the entire society") — and to deflect potential accusations against U.S. intelligence services. In fact, it is quite likely that the U.S. intelligence community itself initiated this idea — as they needed fresh, untarnished covers for their operations.

Among the plans discussed in Washington in October 1982 in connection with the development of the "promotion of democracy" initiative, the notorious campaign for the "protection of human rights" continued to feature prominently. Imperialist forces view it as a long-term component of their ideological strategy. But it would be more accurate not

to call it a "campaign" in the way that the West now uses the term "human rights" for propaganda purposes. A campaign implies a set of coordinated propaganda actions involving a large number of media outlets, aimed at achieving a specific effect within a defined time frame. Today, however, provocative propaganda efforts on the subject of human rights have become a permanent fixture of imperialist messaging. The topic is now a standard element in virtually all ideological subversion and major political operations carried out by imperialism against socialist and developing countries, intended to accumulate long-term propaganda effects over time.

The primary purpose of imperialists invoking slogans like "freedom" and "human rights" in everyday propaganda — setting aside the specific objectives of the "Democracy and Public Diplomacy" program, which serves to mask the hegemonic and aggressive foreign policy of the United States — is to sustain a negative stereotype of socialism, to amplify anti-Soviet prejudice and stoke anti-communist sentiment. This makes sense, given that vague, abstract and difficult-to-define humanitarian concepts — such as those surrounding "freedom" and "human rights" — are, in the eyes of the West, ideal tools for provoking discontent, frustration and unfounded social demands, thereby stirring unrest and instability.

The theme of "human rights" plays a crucial role in shaping the world of social illusions upon which the capitalist system rests. In the context of intensified ideological struggle — where the bourgeoisie strives to maintain control over people's minds — it becomes extremely important for them to accelerate the reproduction of bourgeois illusions in the mass consciousness of non-socialist countries and to spread and implant bourgeois ideology in developing countries. The discussion of "freedoms" and "human rights" as the core of bourgeois ideology, as the main justification for the right to

private ownership of the means of production and the right to exploit human beings, becomes a central element in the system of social illusions that capitalists impose upon the people.

This theme occupied a prominent place in U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz's keynote address to State Department employees in October 1982. He urged them to escalate the "human rights" campaign and announced that the government was allocating billions of dollars to modernize radio stations broadcasting to the USSR and Eastern Europe in order to make the campaign more effective.* In essence, the U.S. Secretary of State was openly declaring the Reagan administration's intention to make interference in the internal affairs of socialist countries through media and information an official policy of the United States. Both Shultz and his deputy, Elliott Abrams, outlined the core ideas that would later be officially codified in the "Democracy and Public Diplomacy" program.

Presidential Directive No. 77 granted the program legal standing without any debate in Congress, a prerogative of the U.S. President. In doing so, the administration sidestepped exposés and criticism from the opposition.

Outwardly, the program appeared perfectly respectable. It purported to justify the "need to protect democratic principles" and encourage the "exchange of ideas and information." It also proclaimed the goal of "opposing undemocratic forces" and coordinating "activities to support the strengthening of democracy and democratic institutions abroad." The directive stated that the implementation of the program should lead to a "more accurate understanding of the nature and ideals of the United States." However, these broad declarations — familiar from Reagan's earlier speeches, especially his address in London, and echoed in statements by his officials — con-

* *General-Anzeiger*, December 20, 1982.

cealed the true thrust of the program. They served merely as abstract camouflage.

The real content of the "Democracy and Public Diplomacy" program lay in its concrete practical measures, which were allocated specific budgets and timelines. Among the top priorities were: Increased radio broadcasting to socialist and developing countries; creation of a special centre for defectors who had emigrated from the USSR; and regular events and gatherings involving émigrés from socialist countries

The program paid special attention to training foreign leadership personnel who would be "capable of cooperating with the United States." There were plans to provide various forms of support — including financial — to political parties in foreign countries, to fund local media outlets, trade unions, religious groups, civil society organizations, local authorities and even judicial-political institutions. In essence, this was about building a political infrastructure in which, in the words of the document, "people and institutions committed to promoting democratic development" would be involved. The objective was to support forces abroad that could serve as a "fifth column" for the United States. These actors — occupying key positions in their societies and influencing broad sectors of public opinion — would help keep their countries aligned with U.S. policy. In short, this was about creating a pro-American elite in foreign countries.

To this end, the program outlined various measures to ideologically shape "current and potential leaders." Examples included: Creating lecture teams composed of high-ranking public and political figures and influential businessmen to tour foreign countries; publishing a special illustrated magazine in English, Spanish and French (languages spoken by the majority of Latin American, African and Asian "leaders"); producing special publications on American democracy and

distributing them abroad; establishing training courses in democracy for police and military leaders from developing countries; and increasing funding for U.S. labour unions' activities abroad, and more. Private companies, foundations and associations were to be actively involved in all of these initiatives. The program also sought to greatly expand training and education for youth from developing countries in American institutions, with the aim of promoting them into leadership positions upon return home. Student exchange programs were to be broadened to inculcate admiration for the American political system and way of life.

Planned expenditures for 1983 were 20 million USD, rising to 65 million USD in 1984. Overall, the program was designed to span 20 years. Since its public launch, many additional components were added — including multimillion-dollar initiatives to distribute American books in foreign countries.

The sheer scope and volume of measures laid out in the program show that it was not directed solely at socialist states, but arguably even more at countries and peoples struggling for national independence and social progress. One of the program's key aims was clearly to pull developing countries away from the influence of socialism, to prevent the positive perception of ties with socialist nations and to discredit the Soviet Union and its foreign policy.

The initiators of this program even like to emphasize that it has an openly subversive character. One of the people close to the president, who has been supplying the president with anti-communist stereotypes for several decades, a certain L. Beilinson, comments on it with pleasure as follows: everyone who is ready to fight communists should be openly offered money: "I call this 'foreign aid for freedom.'" One can imagine what he means by the word "freedom" if one knows

that Beilinson is a great admirer of Goebbels. From him he borrowed the fabrication that supposedly there exist ten commandments prescribing communists to renounce any moral and ethical norms.

In the very first months since the signing of Presidential Directive No. 77, the Reagan administration took many steps towards its implementation. By mid-year, dozens of pseudo-public organizations envisioned by the "Democracy and Public Diplomacy" program were in the formation stage. These included representatives of big business, congressmen and anti-communists of all stripes. The labour centre AFL-CIO became even more active, which, for example, under the banner of the "Project" and according to a plan prepared by the CIA, launched a broad campaign in 1983 targeting union leaders in South Africa. President Reagan proclaimed a whole series of provocative "commemorative dates," such as "Poland Day," "Afghanistan Day," "Cuba Independence Day." All these hypocritical actions serve the internal and external goals of the U.S. government. Receiving echo abroad, they support the "big lie" underpinning Washington's strategic plans.

A number of steps were taken by Washington to promote American foreign policy, involving official administration representatives. Their appearances were meant to somewhat calm public opinion in various countries and regions, alarmed by the aggressive policies and militaristic statements of the U.S. government.

London's *Observer*, reflecting the opinion of those Europeans not lulled by President Reagan's flirtations, wrote the following about one of the events undertaken by Washington under the "Democracy and Public Diplomacy" program: "Soviet leader Y.V. Andropov has launched a determined peace offensive on all fronts. In this connection, Reagan is now sending Vice President G. Bush on a twelve-day trip to

seven European capitals to try to convince allies that America sincerely desires arms reduction. Bush's trip is part of a new propaganda campaign, for which $65 million has been allocated (though the administration prefers to call it 'public diplomacy') aimed at promoting American plans for arms control and the modernization of nuclear forces for Western Europe."*

Just as in June 1982, when the U.S. president, defending his nuclear plans, went to Western Europe to save his reputation under the loud slogan — not nuclear confrontation, but a "crusade," an "ideological war" with socialism in the name of saving democracy — so in January-February 1983, the U.S. vice president again travelled there to save one of the specific armament plans, presenting it as disarmament — the notorious "zero option" — under the guise of spreading the ideas of Western democracy and enlisting the support of Western European leaders. A few months later, he repeated his voyage.

Even these examples show that the "ideologization" of U.S. foreign policy is nothing more than the use of ideological tools, methods and techniques at the level of psychological warfare to justify, legitimize, conceal and actively advance the class interests of the imperialist state under the guise of achieving an allegedly non-partisan, apolitical, supraclass goal — the establishment of some kind of "democratic" harmony throughout the world, with the dominance of the values of the capitalist way of life. It is enough to look under the "new fashionable uniform" flaunted by the most zealous defenders of modern imperialism to see that the "democratic" clothing conceals a "flagrant reactionary imperialism."

Indeed, what other "public diplomacy" actions were there? New trips by Bush to Western Europe to explain an-

* *Observer*, January 23, 1983.

other round of administration statements on disarmament. A special ambassador for "public diplomacy," former Senator R. Stone, was appointed to Central America. He was supposed to prove that the bloody regimes in El Salvador, Chile and other Latin American states, where pro-American juntas operate, are approaching the ideal of democracy allegedly threatened by communists supposedly infiltrating Central America through Nicaragua. To shape public opinion through "public diplomacy methods," a special group was appointed, headed by P. Daley, a former advisor to President Reagan. His task was to ensure the implementation of the plan to deploy American intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe. As the saying goes: "no comment needed."

The "ideologization" of U.S. foreign policy led to increased attention from the Washington administration to organizing a propaganda apparatus and strengthening the material and technical base of foreign policy propaganda. Without this, plans to expand the influence of the ruling class and its elite on public opinion at home and abroad, and on spiritual processes in American society and abroad, would hang in the air.

President Reagan brought the U.S. Information Agency back into the political arena, replacing the name of the International Communication Agency with the old one. With this demonstrative gesture, the president clearly signalled that he approved of USIA's past activities, regardless of what was said about it. He overturned the decision of his predecessor Carter to transform USIA into ICA — a move made specifically in response to public protest against the agency's reactionary role in many overseas events, especially its active anti-Sovietism. However, Reagan also preserved — and even significantly reinforced and expanded — the structure of the new body, albeit under the old name. The new USIA absorbed almost all non-diplomatic foreign policy functions, the so-called

"cultural" relations, and thus controls nearly all key channels of U.S. propaganda influence in foreign countries. The director of USIA became a member of the Cabinet. Other steps were taken to concentrate efforts in U.S. foreign policy propaganda.

The Reagan administration is energetically trying to conduct the entire propaganda choir of its allies — primarily in Western Europe. Within NATO, it has advanced quite far; elsewhere, it succeeds in coordinating only class-oriented evaluations and main political emphases, but the allies do not want to sing entirely in unison with the U.S.

The creation of a united front in psychological warfare against socialist countries has always been a goal of imperialist policymakers.

Since the 1950s, capitalist countries have coordinated broadcasting schedules aimed at socialist countries. This eliminated competition among Western "radio voices."

The unification and coordination of propaganda efforts by imperialist states is clearly seen in anti-socialist campaigns and actions. They begin simultaneously, share identical goals and intensity, focus on the same themes and figures, and use the same arguments. Of course, a shared class position plays a major role, but when it is identically formulated, it is a sign of collusion.

The unity of action among anti-socialist propaganda bodies is also evident in other areas: the exchange of propaganda materials and authors, joint participation in signal interception services, use of *Radio Free Europe* and *Radio Liberty*'s analytic services for studying audiences and media in socialist countries, joint use of relay stations, transmission and rebroadcasting capacities. Western radio journalists sent to socialist countries usually undergo training in Munich at *Radio Free Europe* and *Radio Liberty*.

There is no single centre to direct this activity, despite numerous U.S. attempts to create one. So how is coordination of propaganda efforts by capitalist countries against socialist countries achieved?

Primarily through NATO's organizational machinery. In 1959, at the Atlantic Congress, a NATO Information Service was created "to ensure allied actions on the psychological front," "to generalize experiences and measures to increase the effectiveness of propaganda aimed at the USSR and Eastern European countries." It provides members with propaganda materials, works with the press corps, organizes special courses, seminars, international conferences, etc., on NATO activities and East-West relations.

The NATO Information Service is an important tool for coordinating the ideological struggle against socialism, but only one of such tools. The general propaganda line, the system of evaluations, and the program of major campaigns and actions are developed not only with its participation but also beyond it. This is achieved through numerous meetings, seminars, symposia, conferences held by dozens of pseudo-public organizations controlled by the United States and its allies. The largest of them are the Atlantic Institute of International Affairs in Paris and the North Atlantic Assembly. The issue of anti-socialist propaganda is discussed by the European Council. Meetings of radio centre representatives are held periodically (for example, on the use of "dissidents"). The Reagan administration has introduced the practice of official meetings with propagandists from various capitalist countries under the auspices of the State Department and other government agencies, where foreigners are thoroughly instructed. It is at such meetings that the unified approach is developed, determined by the shared class interests of the participants and clearly manifested in the entire practice of anti-socialist

propaganda.

At the same time, there exists a mechanism for coordinating psychological warfare that is hidden from the public. It operates through channels of diplomatic and political exchanges and consultations, secret agreements and arrangements. The distribution of spheres of influence, coordination of actions by intelligence services and propaganda bodies, the timing and direction of major campaigns, switching transmitter power to overcome jamming, etc., are achieved in this way.

There is not a single Western radio station broadcasting to socialist countries that does not pursue the general Western line of undermining the socialist system and about which we should not be politically and ideologically vigilant.

Almost always, the United States acts as the initiator and leader of coordinated actions by anti-socialist propaganda centres. In this sphere, it appears in the same role as in all other areas of global politics and international relations—as the contender for leadership of the Western world, for the position of hegemon among capitalist countries. By pressuring NATO allies and other capitalist countries, Washington achieves not only the strengthening of the anti-communist front but also the subordination of their foreign policy activities to U.S. plans and control. The leaders of Western countries understand this well and show a certain resistance, which likely prevents the Americans from creating a single propaganda leadership centre for Western countries.

At the head of its main propaganda organs working for foreign audiences, the new administration placed reliable anti-communists known for their adherence to the most reactionary ideas. The president's old Hollywood friend, millionaire C. Wick, became the director of ICA (USIA); the ultra-reactionary Senator J. Buckley became director of the joint

organization *Liberty—Radio Free Europe*; and the leadership of the *Voice of America* was assigned to C. Tomlinson, the ultra-reactionary editor of *Reader's Digest* (President Reagan's favourite reading). All three are ardent McCarthyists.

Among this trio, Buckley is such an odious figure that it is worth focusing on him. Coming from a multimillionaire family, the brother of one of the main ideologists of McCarthyism, he, being a senator in the 1970s, always acted as an implacable enemy of détente and liberation movements, voted against civil rights for Black people, for cutting welfare for the poor, called for crushing freedom-loving peoples of Southeast Asia with military force and advocated sending American troops to Portugal to prevent the development of the revolution. President Reagan made him Deputy Secretary of State. He was responsible, among other things, for aid to puppet regimes. Speaking before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Buckley explained that in his view, "freedom" means when the major countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America have military regimes that ensure "internal stability" and "freedom of action for the U.S." with weapons. Such is the political portrait of the man occupying a key post in the U.S. foreign propaganda system. There is little doubt that the personality of a man who pathologically hates communism would not affect the work entrusted to him. He wants to persecute communists and the radio stations under his control are becoming increasingly hostile towards socialist countries, with broadcasts taking on an increasingly overtly subversive nature. He suspects all staff of being hidden "reds" or "liberals" incapable of following Reagan's "crusade" line. Therefore, the U.S. foreign propaganda apparatus has undergone a purge, which American commentators directly associate with the implementation of the "crusade against communism" and its offspring — the "Democracy and Public Diplomacy" pro-

gram. The mass shake-up of staff is aimed at removing those who show insufficient "aggressiveness" and "assertiveness." The *Voice of America* editorial office was purged personally by C. Wick. As a result, eight high-ranking employees were fired, including a deputy director of the station. They are being replaced by people who meet the "new times" criteria. It is not hard to guess what requirements are imposed on employees of the *Voice* and other U.S. propaganda agencies if they are selected by a person who believes that the U.S. is at war with the Soviet Union.

A telling episode in this sense occurred at the *Radio Free Europe* station, which has always been a den of anti-communists and active counter-revolutionaries, a recognized centre of subversive actions against socialist countries. In June 1983, its director J. Brown resigned. Explaining the reasons for his departure, Brown stated that the cause was "his political disagreements with how the Reagan administration is directing the station's activities." He complained of increased pressure aimed at giving "an even tougher character to the propaganda targeting socialist countries in Eastern Europe."* Known for his antipathy towards communism, Brown had for the past decades actively participated in anti-socialist activities. He fostered and turned into professionals a whole cohort of anti-Soviet figures in the journal *Continent*, which he headed before coming to *Radio Free Europe*. But even he, apparently, could not withstand the course of smug fanatics aimed at burning socialism to the ground.

The issue of staffing in psychological warfare is far from secondary because behind it lies grand politics. Modern American policy of the "big lie" requires people who can blindly echo the president, who see only one and only goal — to hurt the communists — and who would not even allow

* *Christian Science Monitor*, June 15, 1983.

the thought of establishing contact with them. The "crusade" against communism was to be carried out by people ready to impose "democracy" just as Christianity was once imposed on pagans — with fire and sword. The strategy of intimidating socialism demanded abandoning the entire legacy of détente, including people inclined to see it as an acceptable phenomenon and who had acquired some experience in supporting the idea and practice of peaceful coexistence to some extent.

A similar metamorphosis was undergone by U.S. foreign propaganda agencies after the end of the Second World War. Then, with the beginning of the "Cold War," they were thoroughly shaken up to get rid of people accustomed to seeing the Soviet people as allies in a common cause, who were sympathetic to the hardships they had endured and admired their courage, resilience and loyalty to their allied duty. No, the apparatus is not just a technical question in any matter, especially in the ideological sphere. The apparatus is the soul and hands, and the final form of the product they produce depends at least on how they are tuned and what they are ready for. In the context of the White House's "ideologization" of politics, this circumstance takes on special significance because the U.S. foreign propaganda apparatus is counted among the most "close to the president's person" circles, entrusted with being the direct mouthpiece of his candid thoughts.

Speaking in February 1983 at a luncheon organized by the American "Conference of National Conservative Political Leaders," President Reagan stated that his government had "no more important foreign policy initiative" than further strengthening the *Voice of America* radio station together with the Munich stations *Liberty* and *Radio Free Europe*. This was a response to a request from the heads of USIA and the Board for International Broadcasting, under whose cover the CIA's

radio branches — *Liberty* and *Radio Free Europe* — operate, for another increase in funding for their activities.

In general, since coming to power, R. Reagan has made promises almost every month or two to give the green light to the growth of the radio war and to the speedy modernization of American "radio voices." In the summer of 1982, he stated that in the next 6-8 years, several hundred million dollars were planned to be spent on these purposes.* Another major project in this area is considered to be the White House's plan to build the largest radio stations on the West Coast of the USA with power of up to 2,500 kW so that transmissions to the Soviet Union can be carried out without the need for relay stations. This would allow the U.S. government not to depend on political changes in the countries where it has placed its relays. According to some estimates, the financing of the ambitious plans for the "ideologization" of U.S. foreign policy in the coming years will amount to no less than $10-15 billion.

In the spring of 1983, the U.S. administration decided to allocate $1 billion for the modernization of the material and technical infrastructure of the *Voice of America* for the period 1983-88. In addition, extra funds are being allocated to, as Secretary of State Shultz put it, "expand the geographical coverage and political impact of radio broadcasts on the communist world." Behind these words lies a plan to increase the number and power of radio stations broadcasting to socialist countries, expand staff, attract experienced "Sovietologists," implement special programs for the training and retraining of personnel in the largest U.S. educational institutions and research centres, and more. It is also planned to expand American broadcasting to developing countries. As the director of the V*oice of America*, C. Tomlinson, stated, the

* *Voice of America*, June 20, 1982.

administration plans to intensify *Voice* broadcasts to Iran, Afghanistan, India, the Middle East and Africa.* These are the very hotspots of the planet where many of the strategic efforts of the United States are concentrated today. By competing for the audience and entering into competition with national broadcasting in these countries, they aim to influence domestic political and social processes in these states. In this way, the United States either supports or weakens state power, the influence of certain parties or groups, and facilitates both covert and overt operations in the name of the imperialist goals of American monopolies.

Similar plans exist regarding the American radio stations *Liberty*, *Radio Free Europe* and *RIAS* (a radio station in West Berlin). It is planned to equip *RIAS* with new facilities so that they can cover up to 40 per cent of the GDR's territory. The *BBC* is also investing significantly in the material base of its radio station to increase the penetration capacity of its broadcasts to Eastern Europe.

The Americans continue to remain the leader of the radio war of the capitalist world against socialist countries. At the same time, the Soviet Union is increasingly becoming the central target of psychological warfare. This is not a new trend. Already in 1979, the largest part of the *Voice of America* programming was aimed at our country. In 1983, one can confidently say that the Soviet Union had become the main object of falsifications in all U.S. foreign propaganda.

Subversive anti-socialist broadcasting still makes up three-quarters of all American foreign policy radio propaganda. This figure would be much higher if we include "grey" radio propaganda, like that which the U.S. conducts against Cuba from U.S. territory and several Central and South American countries. These seemingly independent radio sta-

* See: *Washington Post*, March 26, 1983.

tions, which cost $3.5 million per year to maintain, broadcast to Cuba for 17-18 hours per day. It is expected that in 1983-84, a radio station specifically built in Miami (Florida, USA) will begin broadcasting to Cuba. They hypocritically want to name it *Free Cuba*. There is no doubt that it will be a spy-diversion centre like *Radio Free Europe*. The purpose of the new subversive radio station is to destabilize the socialist Cuban state. Its organizers do not hide that they intend to provoke confrontation between the Cuban people and their government.* Similar types of "radio voices," mainly funded by the CIA, work against Nicaragua, Grenada, Vietnam, Kampuchea and Laos.

At the 26th CPSU Congress, it was noted: "...The propaganda means of the class enemy have become more active, and its attempts to exert corrosive influence on the consciousness of Soviet people have intensified."** In accordance with the unfolding adventurist policy of Washington, which is calculated to push back socialism and weaken it from within, the intensity and fierceness of the radio war against the Soviet Union have systematically increased, gaining particularly high momentum in recent years. Broadcast time to the USSR continues to increase, primarily to enhance ideological subversion targeting the union republics. New religious stations have also emerged. At the same time, there is a clear trend of concentrating efforts on a number of selected broadcast targets and abandoning those considered politically unpromising for one reason or another.

In 1983, 32 radio stations were working against the Soviet Union in 18 languages for about 208-210 hours per week. The broadcasting time of the four largest among them increased

---

* See: *Soviet Russia*, March 2, 1982.

** *Materials of the 26th Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1981, p. 75, Russ. ed.

by one and a half times — to 42 hours per day. Broadcasts by Israeli radio increased to 9 hours and 30 minutes per day. Several minor "radio voices" disappeared from our airwaves, but two new religious stations were added. *Voice of America* now broadcasts in 9 languages of the peoples of the USSR — 28 hours and 15 minutes per day, second only to *Liberty* (67 hours per day).

There is a noticeable intensification of religious radio stations: in 1969, they broadcast in Russian and other languages of the peoples of the USSR for 11 hours and 30 minutes per day, in 1979 — 28 hours, and at the beginning of 1983 — 44 hours. *Radio Vatican* and the Evangelical *Monte Carlo* began broadcasting in more languages of the peoples of the USSR. This reflects the desire to find individuals or groups in our country whose views diverge in some way from generally accepted opinions or the dominant worldview in order to try to form an independent socio-political force with oppositional sentiments. At the same time, it reflects the naive belief that similar processes to the religious revival in the West are occurring in our country, which to some extent is the result of a growing spiritual crisis within bourgeois society. Projecting onto the Soviet Union the ideas about the negative aspects of the bourgeois way of life is a characteristic phenomenon in the ideological struggle that the bourgeoisie is waging against Marxism-Leninism today. This is a typical psychological warfare approach, reflecting the traditional bourgeois methods of manipulating mass consciousness.

At the same time, one cannot ignore the new motives emerging in religious radio propaganda directed at our country. Among them, one should highlight the declaration of religion as an inseparable part of the national culture of each of the peoples of the Soviet Union. This is nothing more than an incitement to the development of nationalist activity, which,

according to the authors of this ideological subversion, must inevitably lead to acute confrontation with the existing social system.

Here we also observe another feature of the subversive propaganda of the early 1980s. Anti-communists are trying not just to encourage certain Soviet citizens to engage in oppositional activity. The calls for active struggle to preserve religious traditions and the institution of the church as an integral attribute of national culture conceal a "de-ideologized" invitation to organized oppositional activity. They clearly outline a proposal to unite potential opposition elements on a specific platform that excludes multiple interpretations. They essentially suggest a concrete goal around which the "voices" would like to rally the desired opposition. The peculiarity of this type of subversive appeal by Western "voices" is that their anti-Soviet orientation is hidden under an outwardly non-political guise. The "de-ideologized" attack on socialism continues.

The noted trends, as well as a number of others in the West's radio propaganda against socialist countries, reflect the specific features of imperialism's strategic line in the class struggle against socialism at the current stage of historical development.

* * *

Thus, the 1970s passed under the sign of détente and its gradual erosion by imperialist forces, zealous anti-communists and extreme reactionaries of all shades and colours. The goal of these forces was a return to the "Cold War" of the Truman, Eisenhower, J.F. Dulles and McCarthy era, who once succeeded in dragging the entire capitalist world into that war. But it must be acknowledged that the new "Cold

War" did not succeed, no matter how much the dark forces of world reaction, rallied around President Reagan, wished it. We speak only of the desire to revive the "Cold War," of elements of the "Cold War" and so on. Why? Because the "Cold War" was the practical cessation of any positive contacts between capitalist and socialist countries. The "Cold War" lowered an "Iron Curtain" between the West and socialist countries, effectively excluding the latter from the world community, cutting them off from global public opinion. Western politicians openly floated plans to "liberate" socialist countries from communism. This was a true militant "anti-communist pact," which can only be compared to the fascist pacts of the 1930s. In the foreign policy of Western powers, it was a basic denial of socialism's right to exist; in domestic policy — an almost medieval "witch hunt" under the flag of anti-communism. It was a real "crusade" against communism, a total war against Marxism-Leninism and real socialism. Even then, anti-communists attempted to wage the battle for "truth."

The 1970s brought about a normalization of the international situation, as they were marked by the establishment of equal partnerships between capitalist countries and the countries of real socialism, the adoption by most Western countries of the principle of peaceful coexistence and the development of mutually beneficial relations in various areas.

As for ideological struggle, as Y.V. Andropov pointed out in 1977, it is "generated by the objective laws of social development, by the very existence and struggle of classes, by the existence of states with different social systems. Relations between these states may change, but the struggle of ideas remains an inevitable companion of their coexistence... At the same time, our party considers it an important condition for improving the international situation to cleanse the sphere of ideological struggle from the legacy and layers of the 'Cold

War.'" As a result of the peaceful efforts undertaken by the USSR and other socialist countries in the 1970s, the situation in the world changed for the better.

At the beginning of the 1980s, the newly minted crusaders were no longer able to gather everyone under their banners in the Western world. The policy of peaceful coexistence, persistently pursued by the CPSU and the Soviet state, is winning the hearts of people in all corners of the globe. The understanding that the attempt to resolve the historical dispute between the two world social systems "through military confrontation would be disastrous for mankind"* is shared by a growing part of the global public. For example, Western Europe, in the case of the "gas-pipes" deal conflict, demonstrated its interest in détente and did not curtail economic or other contacts with the Soviet Union.

"Imperialism," said the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Y.V. Andropov at the June (1983) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, "is entangled in internal and interstate antagonisms, upheavals, conflicts. This has a deep, but varying impact on the policies of capitalist countries. On the one hand, as has already been said, the aggressiveness of ultra-reactionary forces led by U.S. imperialism has sharply increased. Attempts are being made to turn development backward at any cost. Of course, such a policy will not bring success to the imperialists, but in its adventurism, it is extremely dangerous for mankind. Therefore, it encounters powerful resistance from the peoples, which will undoubtedly grow.

"However, in today's capitalist world, there are also other tendencies, other policies that more realistically take into ac-

---

* Andropov, Y.V., *Speech at the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, June 15, 1983*.

count the situation on the international arena. They understand that irreversible processes have already taken place in the world, they understand the necessity and mutual benefit of long-term peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. For our part, we have said and repeat many times that we are ready for this."*

Yes, the drafts of the "Cold War" still blow through many doors in Western Europe. The North Atlantic Alliance, as an iceberg of anti-détente, chills the atmosphere on the continent, but it has not been able to turn international relations into the Arctic Ocean. Yes, individual ice floes, ice fields break off from it, but this is not a "Cold War." Even the U.S. government is unable to shut down all the channels of contact between Americans and our country. The "Cold War" is fully manifested only in the sphere of class ideological struggle, where a psychological war is raging, aligned with the goals of modern imperialist strategy and now being an obligatory attribute of that strategy.

The June (1983) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee devoted great attention to the questions of ideological struggle on the international arena. It was noted that our ideological opponent is powerless to shake the convictions of the overwhelming majority of Soviet people. But under conditions of international tension, any complacency or inertia creates openings for alien influence. The Party calls on Soviet people to continue developing political vigilance, uncompromising rejection of hostile views and the ability to resist ideological subversion, opportunist and revisionist attacks on real socialism. The Party and the Soviet people are waging an uncompromising struggle against bourgeois ideology.

---

* Andropov, Y.V., *Speech at the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, June 15, 1983*.

Proof